Westshore Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Westshore Elementary School

7110 S WESTSHORE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Julie Florin

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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

Westshore Elementary School

7110 S WESTSHORE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33616

[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	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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 Elementary is committed to rigorous instruction in order to achieve high level of learning for every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

West Shore Elementary will create well-rounded students who achieve academic excellence.

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
		School Improvement Team

School Improvement Team
Meets monthly
Audrey Larcom - School Improvement Chairman
Dianna Portsche - CTA representative
Taylor Fernandez - Parent and Family Engagement Chairman
Tara Le- Reading Coach
Linda Drawdy - Principal
Parents
Students
Community

All members will work together to work towards the schools' mission and vision.
We will use data as a basis of the needs of our students.

Leadership team:
Meets montly
Principal
Assistant Principal
Guidance Counselor
SAC Chair/Academic Coach
Math Resource Teacher
ESE teacher
Grade Level Chairs

Drawdy, Linda — Principal

Problem Solving Leadership Team:
Meets Weekly
Principal
Assistant Principal
Guidance Counselor
School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative
School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative
Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis)
ESE teachers
PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area

The PSLT meets weekly. The purpose of the PSLT is to:
1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through PSLT and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities

PLCs.

Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County.

HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement.

Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development.

Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact.

Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2020, Julie Florin

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	57	72	69	57	59	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	13	11	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	20	22	16	31	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Course failure in Math	0	6	12	15	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	68	67	72	57	57	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	8	2	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	17	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	1	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	8	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	68	67	72	57	57	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	8	2	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	17	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	1	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	8	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	59%	52%	57%	53%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	55%	58%	59%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	67%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	54%	63%	52%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	57%	62%	49%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	46%	51%	50%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	50%	53%	49%	48%	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	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
	2018	64%	53%	11%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
	2018	48%	55%	-7%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	54%	54%	0%	62%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	57%	-6%	64%	-13%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	60%	-17%
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	61%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	17	32	36	22	44	46	23				
ELL	48	53		35	65						
BLK	43	53	40	41	52		21				
HSP	63	63		56	70		60				
MUL	55	45		60	64						
WHT	72	56		64	56		60				
FRL	51	53	45	44	56	52	34				
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	17	43		21	27	20					
ELL	44	50		22	30						
BLK	45	58		45	50		50				
HSP	56	68		46	48		45				
MUL	73			60							
WHT	73	58		63	55						
FRL	51	58	56	45	46	31	47				

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	15	56	75	19	44	40	14				
ELL	48	50		35	20						
BLK	44	58		41	54		38				
HSP	50	59		42	41						
MUL	45			64							
WHT	66	58		67	40		67				
FRL	45	51	65	44	47	50	41				

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	54
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	
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	42
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	62
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	56
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	62
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	49
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.

2019-20
No End of Year FSA data due to Covid-19.
Course Failure for ELA: 108 students are below level in reading.
Course Failure for Math: 81 students are below level in math.
2018-19
Reading lowest quartile for West Shore was 48%. Math lowest quartile was 52%. Science proficiency was 46%.
Math lowest quartile was up from 33% to 52%.

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

2019-20
No End of Year data due to Covid-19.
2018-19
Our science proficiency was 46%. The instructor taught fifth grade science for both groups of students. ELP science was not offered for the 2018-19 school year as the instructor taught math ELP.

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.

2019-20
No End of Year data due to Covid-19.
2018-19
Math achievement had the greatest gap. West Shore was at 5%. Hillsborough County was at 54% however the state math achievement was at 63%.

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

2019-20
No End of Year data due to Covid-19.
2018-19
Math Lowest Quartile had the greatest improvement. West Shore grew from 33% to 52% in math lowest quartile. Our math resource worked with the lowest groups daily for math instruction.

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

2019-20
Course Failure for ELA: 108 students are below level in reading.
Course Failure for Math: 81 students are below level in math.
Attendance: 82 students had 10 or more absences for the 2019-20 school year and would have been higher if students came to school during the fourth nine weeks.
2018-19
Student attendance was below 90% (39 students)
Course failure in ELA or Math (18 students)

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

1. SWD - is the lowest subgroup in ELA and Math on the 2018-19 Florida State Assessment
2. Differentiated instruction to complement our knowledge of standard based instruction
3. Reading Proficiency - 108 students are below level in reading coming into the 2020-21 school year.
4. Math Proficiency - stagnant (fifth grade is significantly below the state average) - 81 students are below level in math coming into the 2020-21 school year
5. Science Achievement - fifth grade scores are below state average on the 2018-19 Florida State Assessment

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities will utilize the new curriculum, Brain Spring, in which VE teachers were trained. Teachers were provided with necessary materials to implement the new curriculum. Time for small group instruction will be protected for the benefit of our struggling learners. West Shore was at 31% and the state guidelines state that we should be at least 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	ESE teachers will weekly assess students for growth as well as I-ready data which will be gathered at the beginning, middle and end of the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cathy Aubin (catherine.aubin@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Brain Spring curriculum will be utilized on a weekly basis for our ESE students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our ESE teachers were trained with this curriculum which involves several modes of learning for our students.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule and protecting time on task with ESE teacher.

Person Responsible	Cathy Aubin (catherine.aubin@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of the Brain Spring curriculum on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible	Cathy Aubin (catherine.aubin@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Proficiency - Math Proficiency as measured by 3, 4, 5 FSA (2019-20) is stagnant (fifth grade is significantly below the state average) According to the 2019-20 Fourth Nine Weeks Report Cards, 81 students are below level in math coming into the 2020-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Monthly math assessments will be utilized in grades 2, 3, 4,5. I-ready assessments will be given at the beginning, middle and end of year. Math Baseline will be utilized in grades 2, 3, 4, 5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Linda Drawdy (linda.drawdy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Committees will meet with grade level teams and vertical teams for planning of differentiated instruction to complement the knowledge of standard based instruction in mathematics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students need differentiated instruction to fill in their learning gaps found by utilizing the month math assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

West Shore would need to continue PLCs to address teacher knowledge of math standards, planning for differentiated instruction, assessments and goals for students. Small group instruction will be utilized to fill in the learning gaps by the teacher.

Person Responsible	Linda Drawdy (linda.drawdy@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2019-20 Fourth Nine Weeks Report Cards, 108 students are below level in reading coming into the 2020-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will monitor weekly through the use of running records. I-ready assessments will be given at the beginning, middle and end of year. SIPPS will be utilized with grades K, 1, 2. Achieve 3000 is new for the 2020-21 school year for students in grades 3, 4, 5. Baseline ELA assessments will be given for grades 2, 3, 4, 5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cathy Aubin (catherine.aubin@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Committees will meet with the reading coach weekly for planning of differentiated instruction to complement the knowledge of standard based instruction in reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students need differentiated instruction to work on specific reading skills. (phonics, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary)

Action Steps to Implement

West Shore would need to continue PLCs to address teacher knowledge of reading standards, planning for differentiated instruction in reading groups, assessments and goals for students. Small group instruction will be utilized to fill in the learning gaps by the teacher and reading coach.

Person Responsible	Cathy Aubin (catherine.aubin@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science Achievement - fifth grade scores are below state average on the 2018-19 Florida State Assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	West Shore will utilize monthly science assessments in fifth grade. The goal would be to improve on the state science assessment by 10% so that West Shore is equal to the state average.

Baseline assessment will be utilized in science at the beginning of the year. |
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Linda Drawdy (linda.drawdy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Incorporate cross grade level planning for science on a quarterly basis in order facilitate rich discussion regarding state standards and planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitating discussion regarding state science standards will increase teacher knowledge in order to plan and teach students.

Action Steps to Implement

Hold quarterly cross grade level planning for science on a quarterly basis to facilitate discussion regarding state standards.

Person Responsible	Linda Drawdy (linda.drawdy@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Increase respect, responsibility, caring, and trust among the students and faculty at West Shore Elementary School.

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.

Parent/Teacher/Student Compact
Family Events as allowed through district guidelines
Parent/Teacher Conference Nights
PTA
SAC
Mid-term Progress Alerts
Community Sponsorship
Monthly Calendar beginning in October
Parent Link Phone/Text/Email
Social Media - Facebook and Twitter

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**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**