

Brevard Public Schools

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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Westside Elementary School

2175 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Woodbury M

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	83%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Westside Elementary School

2175 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

<http://www.westside.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)
Elementary School PK-6	No	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

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.

Through collaboration,
high expectations, and compassion,
WE inspire students to explore
their greatest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together WE will achieve greatness!

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
Rogers, Darlene	Principal	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Oversees the process and makes all final decisions.
Tison, Brianne	Instructional Coach	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Meets weekly with teams for standards-based lesson planning, leads the MTSS process and IPST Meetings, models and mentors teachers using the coaching cycle.
Berry, Holly	Teacher, ESE	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Provides enrichment for GSP students as well as high-achieving students in grade levels K-6.
Kraynik, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Meets weekly with teams for standards-based lesson planning, models and mentors teachers using the coaching cycle.
Smith, Kayla	School Counselor	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Participates in the MTSS and IPST processes, oversees IEP, 504 and EP meetings, provides small group instruction in social-emotional curriculum, supports classroom teachers in social-emotional classroom lessons and strategies.
Williams, Mallory	Assistant Principal	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Participate in MTSS and IPST processes, supports coaches and attends content meetings as necessary, oversees SIP implementation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2015, Stephanie Woodbury M

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.*

7

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	83%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	73	83	92	81	97	93	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	645
Attendance below 90 percent	15	9	16	13	9	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	2	7	6	7	9	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	19	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
	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	3	15	10	9	22	26	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	5	14	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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	111	83	102	90	122	133	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	768
Attendance below 90 percent	69	42	45	37	57	62	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	353
One or more suspensions	5	4	7	4	11	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	13	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	17	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	5	10	14	16	36	33	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

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	3	11	3	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	111	83	102	90	122	133	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	768
Attendance below 90 percent	69	42	45	37	57	62	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	353
One or more suspensions	5	4	7	4	11	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	13	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	17	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	5	10	14	16	36	33	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

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	3	11	3	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	59%	62%	57%	57%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	60%	58%	63%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	57%	53%	62%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	63%	63%	61%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	65%	62%	66%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	53%	51%	52%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	57%	53%	65%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(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	58%	64%	-6%	58%	0%
	2018	50%	63%	-13%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	61%	-2%	58%	1%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	52%	60%	-8%	56%	-4%
	2018	45%	54%	-9%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
06	2019	59%	60%	-1%	54%	5%
	2018	67%	63%	4%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
	2018	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	57%	60%	-3%	60%	-3%
	2018	52%	58%	-6%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	67%	67%	0%	55%	12%
	2018	72%	68%	4%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	56%	0%	53%	3%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	20	45	45	30	48	41	16				
ELL	41	60	68	56	79	56	39				
BLK	42	56	58	51	70	53	59				
HSP	53	58	56	56	72	55	50				
MUL	63	63		66	65						
WHT	65	68	63	69	78	57	65				
FRL	50	63	55	56	69	54	51				
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	12	29	36	23	38	37	10				
ELL	29	46	58	39	46	31					
BLK	39	54	63	45	61	63	48				

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
HSP	44	44	31	51	55	33	41				
MUL	52	55		59	43		62				
WHT	59	55	43	65	61	55	77				
FRL	46	53	44	51	56	51	55				
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	25	48	53	33	50	34	22				
ELL	22	55	53	34	59	48	27				
BLK	39	50	55	44	52	41	40				
HSP	43	66	67	53	66	57	52				
MUL	56	68		60	79						
WHT	70	66	65	69	69	52	82				
FRL	50	61	59	54	63	51	62				

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	63
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
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	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	56
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	59
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	64
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	66
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.

In 2018-2019, our SWD showed the lowest performance as well as the smallest % making learning gains. Contributing factors may include underperforming ESE teachers, teachers with a large caseload of ESE students, and a lack of intervention planning and implementation for these students. Low achievement for our SWD has been a trend over the past several years at Westside. During the 2019-2020 school year, we implemented schoolwide intervention that included all of our SWD that were showing deficits. In the Fall, only 6% of our SWD were meeting grade level expectations on the iReady Reading Diagnostic. By Winter on the same assessment, 19% were meeting grade level expectations and 56% of SWD had made 50% or more progress toward their typical growth goal. Since the assessment was midway through the year, 50% progress shows they were on their way to making a year's worth of growth.

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

On the 2018-2019 FSA, 41% of our ELL students were meeting grade level expectations. Comparatively, that same school year on iReady Reading Diagnostic 3, 63% of our ELL students were meeting grade level expectations. In Winter of 2019, 54% of our ELL students were meeting grade level expectations. Fall 2020 data shows a continued downward trend in ELL students meeting grade level expectations with only 41% of ELL students meeting this benchmark. Additionally, only 48% of our ELL students showed 50% or more progress toward their Typical Growth goal from iReady Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 in 2019. Comparatively, other subgroups had a higher percent of students on track to meet their Typical Growth goal (SWD 56%, Black students 54%, Hispanic students 58%). This decline can be contributed to the coordinator position not being filled and a change in personnel over the course of the year as well as teachers not being well-versed in ELL strategies and their implementation.

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.

We were above the state average in all school-wide components on the 2018-2019 FSA.

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

Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement on the 2018-2019 FSA. That year, we used Title one funding to hire a retired teacher as an instructional assistant that worked in Tier 2 groups with students at every grade level. The lessons were specific, well-delivered, and Progress Monitored regularly.

Our iReady data from Fall 2019 to Winter 2019 shows that 56% of our SWD made 50% or more progress toward their Typical Growth goal from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2, demonstrating that they were on track to meet the goal. Our Federal Index for this subgroup on the 2018-2019 FSA was only 40; showing that a significantly higher percent of students were on track to make learning gains. This can be contributed to a new MTSS process that illuminated struggling students regardless of ESE status, a whole-school intervention block that included all SWD in intervention groups, an ESE coordinator that assisted in creating schedules and training ESE teachers, and a plan for our most needy students that included small group instruction during the entire 90 minute reading block.

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

Though the EWS and ESSA data shows that our SWD are an area of concern from the 2018-2019 FSA, our iReady data from 2019-2020 shows that we were well on the way to making strides in this area as referenced above. We will continue to implement the actions taken last school year to ensure that these students are making gains. An area of concern for this school year is our overall reading scores on iReady. In Winter of 2018, 68% of our students were meeting grade level expectations. In Winter of 2019, that decreased to only 52% and now, in Fall 2020, only 32% are meeting grade level expectations. Additionally, while 43% and 42% of our students met the benchmark in math in Winter 2018 and Winter 2019, respectively, only 19% of our students met grade level expectations on iReady Math Diagnostic 1 in Fall of 2020.

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

1. Overall reading
2. Overall math
3. ELL students meeting grade level expectations
4. SWD meeting grade level expectations
5. Social Emotional Learning for all students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Instructional practice in relation to standards-aligned instruction refers to the development of lesson plans and implementation practices that consistently align to the standards and also address the depth intended in the standard. The use of standards to streamline instruction ensures that teaching practices deliberately focus on agreed upon learning targets, gives a basis by which to inform instruction, and allows for a common standard by which to judge student mastery. This was identified as a critical need after analyzing our iReady data and trends for the past several years. Though many of our students were meeting grade level expectations in recent years, last school year began a downward trend that is continuing into this school year in both reading and math. Strategic standards-aligned planning including specific plans for scaffolding instruction to assist students experiencing learning gaps will help to, once again, increase the number of students performing at grade level expectations.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA percent meeting grade level expectations on the iReady Reading Diagnostic will increase from 32% in Fall of 2020 to 50% in Spring of 2021. 65% of our students will be proficient on ELA FSA. Math percent meeting grade level expectations on the iReady Math Diagnostic will increase from 19% in Fall of 2020 to 35% in Spring of 2021. 68% of our students will be proficient on Math FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

School-wide implementation of teacher clarity, including regular data chats in both ELA and Math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Best practices reveal that when students understand their learning in relation to the goal or standard, learning increases significantly. Since Westside achievement in ELA increased from 17-18 to 18-19 while employing this strategy, and 2020 offered insufficient data in relation to this goal, we will continue to employ this strategy with fidelity in the 2020-2021 school year.

Action Steps to Implement

Participate in weekly ELA and/or Math planning meetings with a focus on planning for teacher clarity. Standards-based objectives, supports for scaffolding instruction including using District-provided standards focus documents in ELA to implement scaffolded questioning and training in using iReady scaffolding supports for both ELA and Math, success criteria and student progress monitoring will be designed for easy implementation in the classroom. This will increase the likelihood that data chats and teacher clarity are occurring regularly.

Person Responsible

Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)

Conduct remediation groups within the 90 minute reading block for students not meeting success criteria on the previous day's learning objective. Groups will be formed using exit slips based on standards-based learning objectives and will include all students that did not meet success criteria, including SWD.

Person Responsible

Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)

Provide teachers with professional development and embedded coaching cycles with observations and feedback on teacher clarity and data chats. PD will include iReady Standards Mastery use and data analysis, The Writing Revolution, coach modeling small group instruction, and error analysis in math.

Person Responsible Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)

Leadership team will collaborate to analyze school-wide data and trends to tier teachers for targeted coaching support.

Person Responsible Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)

SWD will be monitored monthly through MTSS meetings. They will participate in intervention groups as needed.

Person Responsible Mallory Williams (williams.mallory@brevardschools.org)

ASP and CARES money will be used to hire an Instructional Assistant that will provide small group instruction outside of the 90 minute reading block for BGL students. She will also provide Tier 2 instruction in math during our Walk to Intervention block.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our SWD include all students with an IEP. This is a relatively large group in our school, comprising 21% of our student population. In the past, this group has been the group that makes the least amount of growth and has the smallest % of students meeting grade level expectations. Though we made great strides in this area last year and 56% of our SWD made 50% or more progress toward their Typical Growth Goal from iReady Reading Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2, we still have a great deal of room for improvement. Currently, only 10% of our SWD met grade level expectations on the Fall 2020 iReady Reading Diagnostic 1.

Measurable Outcome:

Our SWD meeting grade level expectations will increase from 10% on Diagnostic 1 to 25% on Diagnostic 3 on the iReady Reading Diagnostic. In 2019, 21% of our SWD were proficient on ELA FSA. In 2021, 40% of our SWD will be proficient on ELA FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Evaluate and select relevant evidence-based interventions. This strategy focuses on using evidence-based interventions that include research-based practices and experimental studies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This strategy will help us to continue the path of improvement we began last year. In years past, SWD did not often receive intervention because they already had an IEP. Last year, we implemented school-wide intervention and were sure to include struggling SWD. Continuing to select evidence-based interventions for these students will help to ensure that growth will be made by our SWD.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor Student data through MTSS. All data, including iReady and one other grade-level wide assessment (assessment varies by grade level but is consistent for the grade level), classroom performance data, ESE performance data, attendance, and behavioral data will be reviewed twice each month to monitor students, including SWD.

Person Responsible

Brianne Tison (tison.brianne@brevardschools.org)

Plan interventions specific to the needs of each student that is showing deficits in any area. The interventions will be research-based and will be implemented daily for each child in need.

Person Responsible

Brianne Tison (tison.brianne@brevardschools.org)

Progress monitor weekly and determine whether the interventions are effective or need to be adjusted in some way. Meet and regroup based on data at least every 6 weeks.

Person Responsible

Brianne Tison (tison.brianne@brevardschools.org)

Students that are not making adequate progress with the interventions will be brought to IPST to determine further needs, including IEP adjustments, Tier 3 interventions, and further evaluations.

Person Responsible

Mallory Williams (williams.mallory@brevardschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Focusing on Social Emotional Learning involves teaching students to self-monitor and self-regulate behaviors and emotions as well as teaching specific ways in which to do that. It also involves building the classroom and school community so that each child is a valued member of the school environment. This impacts student learning because misbehaviors negatively impact learning for everyone and teaching specific SEL skills help to alleviate these negative behaviors. After reviewing our EWS data, we realized that 19% of our students in the past 2 years have exhibited 2 or more Early Warning Signs and 7-8% of our students in those same years experienced 2 or more suspensions. Though the numbers went down slightly last school year after implementing PBIS school-wide, there was not a significant decrease in these EWS.

Measurable Outcome:

In the 2019-2020 school year, we had 25 in-school suspensions and 24 out-of-school suspensions. In the 2020-2021 school year, we will have no more than 20 in-school suspensions and 20 out-of-school suspensions, reducing the number of suspensions by 20%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mallory Williams (williams.mallory@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Implement daily class meetings using a research-based curriculum focusing on SEL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Copious research has shown that the impact of social-emotional learning (SEL) runs deep. SEL programs are shown to increase academic achievement and positive social interactions, and decrease negative outcomes later in life. SEL helps individuals develop competencies that last a lifetime.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement daily classroom meetings using the Sanford Harmony curriculum across all grade levels.

Person Responsible

Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)

Monitor behavior trends and suspensions.

Person Responsible

Mallory Williams (williams.mallory@brevardschools.org)

Through the MTSS and IPST processes, adjust SEL learning as necessary for individuals that require a Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention.

Person Responsible

Brianne Tison (tison.brianne@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Monitoring the progress and achievement of our ELL students will be done simultaneously with the SWD through the MTSS and IPST processes. These students will be placed in interventions alongside their classmates as needed. We will implement the ESOL tutoring as it becomes available through the district.

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.

In order to build and maintain a positive school culture and environment, we collect and analyze data from all stakeholders. According to our students on the Youth Truth survey, our two areas of strength were engagement and relationships. Even with these two areas being our highest, compared to the district we have growth to make especially when looking at 6th grade. We have begun a social emotional class on our activity wheel for 6th grade to ensure that we are providing the skills for our students to make relationships with each other, as well as the adults in the school building.

When reviewing the data collected from our teachers on the Winter Insight Survey we made great growth from the previous year. Our lowest area is observation and feedback. Our goal this year as a leadership team is to not only ensure we are observing and providing feedback, but also following up to review the implementation of our feedback which according to the survey is what our teachers are looking for. Our second area needing the most growth was the learning environment. We made great gains in this area going from 6.5 percentile (2018) to 7.3 (2019). Implementing PBIS throughout the 19-20 school year increased our data in this year and moving into year two we should continue to see an improvement because PBIS provides the foundation for consistent expectations and teachers feeling supported when it comes to dealing with student behavior.

According to our parent survey, 96% of parents feel welcome at the school, 83% feel that the office staff is polite and helpful, 68% attend events to support academic success, 50% receive communication from teachers weekly (with 19% monthly and 18% daily), 87% receive communication about how to help their child at home and 68% said they were given the opportunity to provide feedback to the school. These numbers indicate that our families are happy, welcomed and feel included in our school, which leads to a positive school culture and environment.

We will continue, as best we can during these unprecedented times, to make all stakeholders feel welcome and to build a positive school culture through continued communication and positivity within our school environment.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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