

Hernando County School District

Westside Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Westside Elementary School

5400 APPLGATE DR, Spring Hill, FL 34606

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/wes>

Demographics

Principal: Kristina Stratton

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Westside Elementary School

5400 APPLGATE DR, Spring Hill, FL 34606

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/wes>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Westside Elementary will provide an engaging and challenging educational experience in a collaborative, student focused environment. Together, our staff and school community will empower all students to be competent, productive, caring, and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student, every day!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stratton, Kristina	Principal	The School Based Leadership Team meets every two weeks to review data, discuss trends, and vertically plan using formative assessment data.
Mercer, Brenda	Other	
Howard, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Boysel, Adrienne	Teacher, K-12	
Kublick, Dana	Assistant Principal	
LaPlatney, Deana	School Counselor	
Stanina, Nicole	Attendance/ Social Work	
Dasilva-Serrano, Brittney	Teacher, K-12	
Deets, Tina	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/19/2014, Kristina Stratton

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/15/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	104	90	95	120	93	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	12	9	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	4	6	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	3	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	5	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	104	90	95	120	93	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	12	9	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	4	6	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	3	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	5	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	54%	57%	55%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	53%	58%	58%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	53%	56%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	58%	63%	71%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	62%	62%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	48%	51%	56%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	54%	53%	56%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	57%	-3%	58%	-4%
	2018	55%	62%	-7%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	59%	-6%	58%	-5%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	57%	52%	5%	56%	1%
	2018	67%	53%	14%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	70%	67%	3%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	62%	-9%	64%	-11%
	2018	70%	60%	10%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
	2018	82%	56%	26%	61%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	55%	9%	53%	11%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	53	60	41	56	53	64				
ELL	27			36							
BLK	42	53		58	60		50				
HSP	41	65	80	49	48	60	46				
MUL	63			59							
WHT	62	64	67	70	52	59	73				
FRL	52	60	68	58	51	53	64				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	31	50	59	51	50	50	18				
BLK	44	52	40	68	54	55	50				
HSP	54	70	75	76	70	83	64				
MUL	62			75							
WHT	65	55	44	80	69	40	81				
FRL	54	52	49	76	61	57	69				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	42	42	33	43	53	31				
ELL	17			38							
BLK	41	65		59	60						
HSP	42	55		59	48		8				
MUL	75			92							
WHT	59	56	56	74	64	61	65				
FRL	53	59	57	70	62	58	54				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

FSA Math learning gains (52%) had the lowest performance, a decline of 6% from the 2018-19 data. Westside Elementary had an increase of transfer students during 2018-19.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

FSA Math percent proficient (64%) showed the greatest decline, 13% from 2018-19 data. Westside Elementary School had an increase of transient students during 2018-19.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

FSA Math learning gains (52%) has the greatest gap when compared to the state average (62%). Westside Elementary School had an increase of transient students during 2018-19.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

FSA ELA learning gains showed an increase of 16% in 2018-19. (2019: 67%; 2018 51%). We increased the number of MTSS groups providing small group ELA instruction. In addition, we offered reading instruction for our third graders during specials.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Decrease the number of students receiving a level 1 on FSA ELA and Math.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Reading proficiency
2. Improve comprehension reading strategies
3. ELA learning gains
4. Math learning gains
5. ELL - ESSA subgroup (2019 ELA Federal Index: 32%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus	Teachers will collaboratively plan and deliver rigorous standards-based lessons. When reviewing historical data, our overall reading and math proficiency have not increased.
Description and Rationale:	When analyzing in comparison to the state and district, WES (Reading: 2018-59%, 2019-56%; Math: 2018-77%, 2019-64%) is below the state average. Our ESOL subgroup performed below the Federal Percent of Point Index (2019-32%).
Measurable Outcome:	<p>To increase our overall ELA proficiency and the percentage of students making learning gains on FSA in our overall learning gains category and bottom quartile category in grade 5. Increase the percentage of students who achieved learning gain target in iReady reading and math in grades K-4.</p> <p>Mid-year (AP2) iReady data</p> <p>K: Reading - 29%, Math - 32%</p> <p>1: Reading - 40%, Math - 19%</p> <p>2: Reading - 30%, Math - 20%</p> <p>3: Reading - 38%, Math - 28%</p> <p>4: Reading - 29%, Math - 29%</p> <p>5: Reading - 14%, Math 11%</p> <p>Due to the unexpected change in instruction, all students went to digital learning in March. Due to this change, we will closely monitor student progress and provide additional support to students with reading deficiencies.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristina Stratton (stratton_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Delivering professional development will improve teachers' knowledge in all core subjects, to include active reading strategies. Teachers will provide reading and math interventions to students based on iReady diagnostic data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There are new teachers, and changes to teams have been made, so professional development on delivering rigorous, standards-based lessons infused with technology and active reading strategies is necessary for success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Lesson plans will include specific reading strategies.
2. Lesson plan will include standards-based questions.
3. Collaborative lesson planning through PLC, in addition to SWAP and built-in planning time.
4. Students will use iReady LAFS books as a resource to supplement and connect to the standards.
5. MTSS interventions will make connections to Tier I instruction by including core text and strategies.
6. Students will use iReady program for a minimum of 45 minutes per week.
7. Kindergarten, 1st, and 3rd grade ELA teachers will complete year 2 of LETRS training. 2nd, 3rd math, and ESE teachers servicing grades K-3 will begin year 1 of LETRS training.
8. Provide opportunity for students to receive additional support in core subjects through extended day learning.
9. Administration will monitor lesson plans, PLCs, perform classroom walkthroughs, and monitor data.

Person Responsible Kristina Stratton (stratton_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Through the focus instructional practices, extended learning, and collaborative planning, the number of students scoring a Level 1 on FSA will decrease.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Parents are given multiple opportunities to participate in decision making at Westside. They are invited to join the SAC committee, participate in the Title I input survey, they are encouraged to follow our social media platforms (Facebook, school website, admin Twitter), and join the WES PTO.

Community members are encouraged to be part of the success of Westside. Our business partners provide teachers and students with various resources throughout the school year and are recognized for their contributions. The PR Committee promotes the positive culture through videos, social media, and outreach to the business community surrounding Westside.

At Westside, we value the appearance and cleanliness of our physical facility. All members of the school community contribute and participate in updates and beautification projects. The support from the community from the half-cent sales tax enabled numerous updates to our school campus this year.

All staff are involved in decision making and problem solving on our campus through the Organizing to Lead Committee. This committee works to establish and maintain a positive culture among staff and students. Additionally, administration celebrates teachers and staff in multiple ways, recognizing birthdays and special events, and successes in and out of the classroom.

Our Equity Committee is made up of the WES Core Team and grade-level team leaders. This committee will focus on ESSA subgroups. Students in these subgroups will be assigned mentors to help monitor attendance, grades, and academic progress. Mentors will check in with their students weekly to address any concerns.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.