

Brevard Public Schools

West Shore Junior/Senior High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Shore Junior/Senior High School

250 WILDCAT ALLEY, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.westshore.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Eric Fleming T

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2006

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (91%) 2017-18: A (91%) 2016-17: A (92%) 2015-16: A (91%)
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	N/A

* 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 Brevard 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Shore Junior/Senior High School

250 WILDCAT ALLEY, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.westshore.brevard.k12.fl.us>

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)
High School 7-12	No	13%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

West Shore Junior/Senior High School, a center for excellence, creates a nurturing secondary learning environment (grades 7-12) that provides students with unique experiences for intellectual development, academic achievement, and preparation for life's work.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Excellence Achieved

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
Fleming, Rick	Principal	
Orton, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Franco, Amy	Instructional Media	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/1/2006, Eric Fleming T

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (91%) 2017-18: A (91%) 2016-17: A (92%) 2015-16: A (91%)
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	N/A
* 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	181	173	174	144	155	140	967
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/21/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	175	154	163	147	142	955	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3	6	3	21	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3	3	16	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	175	154	163	147	142	955
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3	6	3	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3	3	16
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	97%	59%	56%	97%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	52%	51%	77%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	40%	42%	82%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	98%	48%	51%	99%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	85%	49%	48%	82%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	85%	45%	45%	79%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	95%	66%	68%	98%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	98%	70%	73%	99%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
07	2019	94%	58%	36%	52%	42%
	2018	91%	56%	35%	51%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	96%	63%	33%	56%	40%
	2018	95%	65%	30%	58%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
09	2019	99%	62%	37%	55%	44%
	2018	100%	60%	40%	53%	47%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
10	2019	98%	59%	39%	53%	45%
	2018	99%	61%	38%	53%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	99%	62%	37%	54%	45%
	2018	99%	62%	37%	54%	45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-99%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	90%	53%	37%	48%	42%
	2018	92%	55%	37%	50%	42%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	66%	34%	67%	33%
2018	99%	67%	32%	65%	34%
Compare		1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	74%	24%	71%	27%
2018	100%	73%	27%	71%	29%
Compare		-2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	71%	28%	70%	29%
2018	100%	70%	30%	68%	32%
Compare		-1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	61%	38%	61%	38%
2018	98%	62%	36%	62%	36%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	60%	38%	57%	41%
2018	99%	60%	39%	56%	43%
Compare		-1%			

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	85	75		90	70						

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
ASN	100	75		100	92		95	96	100	100	100
BLK	100	70		100	92			100			
HSP	95	64	67	90	82	64	86	100	87	100	100
MUL	100	64	73	100	84		100	100	100	100	100
WHT	96	75	76	99	84	86	96	98	100	100	99
FRL	100	72	71	95	86	83	91	100	96	100	93
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	91	64									
ASN	96	73	91	100	88		100	100	100		
BLK	100	73		95	74		100	100			
HSP	100	79	100	100	89	87	93	100	100	100	100
MUL	98	74	100	100	84		95	100	100		
WHT	96	75	77	99	81	75	96	100	99	100	100
FRL	97	77	90	99	72	68	96	100	97	100	100
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	100	86		94	60						
ASN	94	70	64	100	89		100	95	100	100	94
BLK	86	71	70	100	76	77	90	100			
HSP	96	74	79	100	86	95	97	97	100	100	100
MUL	100	72	85	100	81		100	100	100	100	100
WHT	98	79	84	98	82	80	98	100	100	99	96
FRL	92	67	67	99	83	77	100	97	100	100	100

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	91
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	1006
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	80
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	95
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	92
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	85
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	92
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	
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	92
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	90
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.

Although West Shore Jr/Sr High School remains among the highest performing schools in the district and state with regard to assessment results, we do focus on areas that we see trend data declines. Our most recent review of scores shows a decline of 2% within our overall 2019 ELA Learning Gains from 75% of students scoring at Level 3 and above to 73% of students scoring at Level 3 and above. This data also negatively correlated with our ELA students in the Lowest 25% in regards to Learning Gains and reflects the absence of a key ELA teacher on leave for the entire 2018-2019 school year. While we had a certified ELA Teacher in that particular classroom, the continuity of instruction and degree of expertise were missing. This was reflected in student scores and grades. As a result of COVID we do not have 2019-2020 data and will focus on known deficiencies identified from 2018-2019.

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

During a comprehensive review of our 2018-2019 assessment data, West Shore saw a 6 point drop on ELA Learning Gains for our Lowest 25% from 82% of students scoring at Level 3 and above down to 77% of students scoring at Level 3 and above. A contributing factor to this drop was a key teacher in our English Department who was out on medical leave last year and her absence disrupted some continuity in instruction for some of our students. The drop does not appear to be part of an ongoing downward trend with regard to ELA assessment results. Due to COVID we were not able to fully implement key improvement strategies. 2020-2021 Reading Plus data will be used as a diagnostic tool to assess needed gaps and focus points.

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.

West Shore remains well above the district/state and in other cases national averages in ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies (Civics), SAT, ACT, AP Scores, and PSAT.

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

2019 Mathematics students in the Lowest 25% had Learning Gains that showed a 10 point improvement from 75% of students scoring at Level 3 and above to 85% of students scoring at Level 3 and above. We shifted some teaching assignments around to maximize some expertise in math scaffolding. Our math department uses interactive notebooks for several math subjects and this delivery variation seemed to have developed more math confidence in some of our lower performing students. COVID shutdown did not allow for 2020 assessment therefore will continue with aforementioned practice in preparation for 2020/2021 assessments.

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

It appears from review of the ESSA data that our Students With Disabilities had 80% of students scoring at Level 3 and above on the 2019 FSA compared to all other groups which scored at 90% at Level 3 and above.

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

1. Improve ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains scoring Level 3 or above from 2019.
2. Meet or exceed Assessment thresholds in ELA, Math, SS, Science, SAT, AP, PSAT, ACT.
3. Meet or exceed our 1006 point overall School Grade Accountability score from 2019.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During a comprehensive review of our 2018-2019 assessment data, West Shore saw a 6 point drop on ELA Learning Gains for our Lowest 25% from 82% down to 77%. A contributing factor to this drop was a key teacher in our English Department was on medical leave last year and her absence disrupted some continuity in instruction for some of our students. The drop does not appear to be part of an ongoing downward trend with regard to ELA assessment results. .
Measurable Outcome:	West Shore Jr/Sr High school will increase our ELA Lowest 25% students scores from 77% of students scoring at Level 3 and above on the 2019 FSA to 80% of students scoring at Level 3 and above on the 2020 FSA ELA test. Due to COVID shutdown, we will use the student data from the 2020 Fall Reading Plus assessments and also look at the Fall FSA retake test results to guide instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rick Fleming (fleming.rick@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Under the CRISS (CReating Independence Through Student Owned Strategies) umbrella we decided to focus on Webb's Depth of Knowledge and higher order questioning during our 2019 SIP cycle. While we were pleased with some growth in the area of having students interpret complex text, we wanted to go a step further in 2020 by using the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) as a mechanism to track complex text at the center of teachers' lessons. COVID19 cut short our effort therefore we will re-calibrate our work in this area for 2020-2021.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After a brief overview of using the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) to observe classrooms from district leadership during summer training, we decided that we would employ this strategy with our walk-throughs for the 2020 School Year. In order to calibrate our leadership team in using the instrument we sought help from our district resource teacher, Nancy Gray, who trained and accompanied our leadership team on our walk-throughs in September 2019. Starting out small this year, our main focus is to tally our IPG's using Core Action 1 of the model. If through Core Action 1 observation we determine that text is at the center of the lesson then the next step is to determine if the text is grade level appropriate or complex enough. Of the 20 classrooms observed, it was determined that 12 had some form of text at the center of the lesson. Due to COVID19 cutting this effort short for 2020 we have recommitted our work in this area and will continue to have this as a focus.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Read and Review Instructional Practice Guide - Core Action 1
2. Review and provide overview to teachers on the Instructional Practice Guide
3. Set up Training with ELA Resource Teacher for West Shore Administrative Team
4. Calibrate using walk-through data gathered
5. Provide feedback/discussion opportunity with teachers
6. Review IPG Literature with teachers for 2020-2021

Person Responsible Rick Fleming (fleming.rick@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Parent Survey Info (carried over from POSITIVE CULTURE SECTION)

Our parent survey results for the 2019-2020 school year shows that West Shore should continue to focus on improving communication between teachers and parents regarding the progress of our students. The survey results show that 22.79 % of middle school parents and 11.85 % of high school parents report that their child's teacher communicates with them weekly about their child's progress. Equally concerning are the parents (middle school 15.44%, high school 28.91%) that report that teachers never communicate regarding their child's progress. When we delved into the comments a common thread was that teachers are not updating/recording their grades weekly. This data shows that we need to improve our weekly communication in addition to improving the communication when students transition from middle school to high school. By bringing increased awareness of this perception to our teachers coupled with administrative monitoring of grades and postings we will increase the percentage of parents reporting weekly communication from teachers by at least 5% in both middle (from 22.79% to 27.79%) and high school (from 11.85% to 16.85%).

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.

West Shore Jr/Sr High School uses a variety of techniques to gauge our school positivity culture from all stakeholders. Obvious constraints due to COVID19 has put more challenges in front of us to accomplish this task. Using Parent Surveys, West Shore identifies key pattern areas identified by parents to assist us in planning for continuous improvement. For our student body, we participated in a "Youth Truth" survey in order to solicit valuable feedback from our students in identifying areas that are important to them and how we can bridge the gap with current practice. Finally, we make effective use of the TNTP Insight Survey completed by staff in order to get their perspectives and perceptions on leadership within the school. Each of these survey mechanisms provide an enormous amount of valuable data used to steer continuous improvement in our school culture. Regarding the Youth Truth survey, students at West Shore Jr/Sr High were asked in January 2020 about their perceptions of their school in terms of Engagement, Academic Rigor, Relationships, Belonging & Peer Collaboration, Culture, College & Career Readiness, and Academic Support Services. In addition, students provided feedback about School Safety.

High School Results:

Compared to other participating high schools, West Shore Sr High students' highest rated themes were:

- Belonging & Peer Collaboration (80th Percentile) (District ~30th)
- Culture (75th Percentile) (District <25th)

and the lowest rated themes were:

- Engagement (29th Percentile) (District ~28th)
- College & Career Readiness (34th Percentile) (District ~20th)

Compared to other participating high schools, West Shore Sr High students' highest rated question within the key themes was:

- Most students in this school want to do well in class (which is in the Culture theme)
- and the lowest rated question within the key themes was:
- I enjoy coming to school most of the time (which is in the Engagement theme)

Middle School Results:

Compared to other participating middle schools, West Shore Jr High students' highest rated themes were:

- Belonging & Peer Collaboration (89th Percentile) (District ~20th)
- Culture (83rd Percentile) (District ~23rd)

and the lowest rated themes were:

- Engagement (42nd Percentile) (District ~15th)
- Relationships (58th Percentile) (District ~15th)

Compared to other participating middle schools, West Shore Jr High students' highest rated question within the key themes was:

- Most students at this school are friendly to me (which is in the Belonging & Peer Collaboration theme)
- and the lowest rated question within the key themes was:
- What I learn in class helps me outside of school (which is in the Engagement theme)

On the Insight Staff Survey conducted in the Fall 2019 our lowest ranking domain at 5.7 on a 10 point scale was Instructional Planning for Student Growth which will be an area of focus moving forward, We plan to address elements within this dimension through our pre-observation conferences with teachers.

Parent Survey

(CONTINUED UNDER PLANNING FOR IMPROVEMENT ...ADDITIONAL PRIORITIES)

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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