
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 | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

Westchester Elementary School

12405 ROYAL PALM BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33065

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Geraine

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 57% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (55%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| 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 Broward 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 | 16 |

Westchester Elementary School

12405 ROYAL PALM BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33065

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">47%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">75%</p> |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

The Philosophy of Westchester Elementary School is to foster the development of each child to his/her greatest potential. All faculty and staff members have a basic responsibility to create an environment conducive to learning, and to provide necessary opportunities for learning to take place. Westchester Elementary School is dedicated to providing excellence in education through innovation; to instill a life-long love of learning in students and teachers; and to celebrating diversity within a caring environment. Westchester will nurture competent and thoughtful citizens who are positively engaged in the making of the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We use the same Vision Statement as our District:
Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world

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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Frame Geraine, Melissa | Principal | Instructional leader who oversees the daily operation of the school. |
| Goodman, Avis | Assistant Principal | Maintains safety and security of all staff and students. Conducts teacher observations and data chats. Supervises all staff members. |
| Hartner, William | Assistant Principal | Maintains safety and security of all staff and students. Conducts teacher observations and data chats. Supervises all staff members. |
| Weston, Gabriella | SAC Member | 5th grade teacher and SAC Chair....responsible for instructing her students by following the Florida Standards. Also conducts monthly SAC meetings and assist with School Improvement Plan. |
| Miniet, Miriam | Instructional Coach | Math Coach for all grade levels. Facilitates professional development for teachers. Title 1 Liaison, makes sure we are in compliance with all Title 1 mandates and also ESOL Coordinator who is responsible for maintaining ESOL records and testing of ELL students. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/16/2020, Melissa Geraine

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.*

6

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

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) | 57% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (55%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| 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 | 145 | 185 | 174 | 173 | 187 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1073 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 30 | 31 | 23 | 27 | 31 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 | 35 | 24 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 31 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |

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 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 36 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

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 | 178 | 187 | 190 | 201 | 222 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1179 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 17 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

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 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 178 | 187 | 190 | 201 | 222 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1179 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 17 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

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 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 74% | 59% | 57% | 70% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 70% | 60% | 58% | 63% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 54% | 54% | 53% | 44% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 75% | 65% | 63% | 73% | 61% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 71% | 66% | 62% | 76% | 63% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 53% | 51% | 52% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 69% | 46% | 53% | 48% | 45% | 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 | 71% | 60% | 11% | 58% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 59% | 9% | 57% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 71% | 62% | 9% | 58% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 75% | 58% | 17% | 56% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 73% | 59% | 14% | 56% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 75% | 56% | 19% | 55% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 73% | 65% | 8% | 62% | 11% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 72% | 63% | 9% | 62% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 75% | 67% | 8% | 64% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 74% | 63% | 11% | 62% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 68% | 64% | 4% | 60% | 8% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 62% | 14% | 61% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 66% | 49% | 17% | 53% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 51% | 16% | 55% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 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 | 31 | 42 | 38 | 36 | 59 | 50 | 27 | | | | |
| ELL | 66 | 65 | 62 | 75 | 76 | 50 | 55 | | | | |
| ASN | 92 | 84 | | 97 | 97 | | 87 | | | | |
| BLK | 67 | 67 | 48 | 65 | 66 | 50 | 62 | | | | |
| HSP | 68 | 63 | 51 | 72 | 66 | 46 | 60 | | | | |
| MUL | 85 | 83 | | 78 | 89 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 74 | 68 | 81 | 71 | 40 | 81 | | | | |
| FRL | 66 | 67 | 55 | 67 | 68 | 49 | 58 | | | | |

| 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 | 32 | 48 | 52 | 42 | 52 | 48 | 44 | | | | |
| ELL | 73 | 80 | 67 | 70 | 68 | 60 | 61 | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | 80 | | 89 | 86 | | 79 | | | | |
| BLK | 67 | 68 | 47 | 67 | 63 | 50 | 63 | | | | |
| HSP | 74 | 72 | 53 | 70 | 62 | 41 | 66 | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | 73 | | 76 | 70 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 66 | 61 | 82 | 68 | 56 | 72 | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 67 | 68 | 50 | 67 | 63 | 47 | 61 | | | | |
| 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 | 32 | 43 | 33 | 33 | 58 | 48 | 19 | | | | |
| ELL | 59 | 64 | 50 | 60 | 73 | 45 | 21 | | | | |
| ASN | 81 | 61 | | 94 | 91 | | 91 | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | 62 | 56 | 65 | 70 | 49 | 28 | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 61 | 44 | 65 | 72 | 48 | 59 | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | 46 | | 79 | 62 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 66 | 34 | 79 | 79 | 60 | 52 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 58 | 51 | 66 | 73 | 54 | 38 | | | | |

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 | 68 |
| 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 | 79 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 540 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 40 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

English Language Learners

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 66 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 91 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 64 |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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 | 84 |
| 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 | 72 |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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.

Lowest 25 Percentile in Math, our 5th grade FSA Math scores decreased. A possible contributing factor could be that all 5th grade students are served by two teachers due to departmentalizing.

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

Math lowest 25 Percentile again possibly because of departmentalizing instead of remaining with the same teacher all day.

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.

Our science scores are 23 points higher than the state's average. Our science is emphasized throughout all grade levels. Our teachers vertical plan and team plan for science. We also have a science specials, giving the students enrichment in science to further enhance their learning.

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

The percentage of math learning gains showed the most improvement. We incorporated a 30 minute Math special for our 5th grade students.

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

Area of concern is the number of students in grades 3- 5 who scored a level 1 on ELA FSA.

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

1. Improving FSA scores for our Students with Disabilities
2. Increase the FSA math scores for the lowest 25 percentile
3. Increase the FSA ELA scores for the lowest 25 percentile
4. Increase the percentage of students making math gains
5. Increase the number of students in K-2 who are reading on grade level upon entering 3rd grade.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will continue to progress monitor all students in grades 3 - 5 by using School City Assessments, Reading Plus and IReady data. Students in primary grades will use Raz Kids. Students will continue to be pulled out for their ESE services. Students are also in small groups in their class and are getting double dosed in reading.

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.

We continue to have family engagement events for our students and their families. Our families and stakeholders are invited to all events. We get the information out regarding our events by using a variety of modalities such as newsletters, website, school marquee, and social media. Our PTA is also very active and assist with getting all stakeholders involved. Parents are also welcome to volunteer at the school and in classrooms fostering an inclusive and welcoming environment. Our families are also warmly greeted in the car line daily as well as in our front office.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$15,033.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 369-Technology-Related Rentals | 2681 - Westchester Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 106.0 | \$15,033.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Licenses for the following: Reading Plus, School City, Suite 360 and Raz Kids.</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$15,033.00 |