Westchester Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Westchester Elementary School

12405 ROYAL PALM BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33065

[no web address on file]

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	47%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

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	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	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	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	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	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	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 s, 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
			Notes: Licenses for the following: Reading Plus, School City, Suite 360 and Raz Kids.			
					Total:	**$15,033.00**