Westside Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Westside Elementary School

1700 5TH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/westside/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Dwayne Copeland

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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: D (36%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: C (49%)
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	CS&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 Volusia 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

Westside Elementary School

1700 5TH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/westside/pages/default.aspx

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	98%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	D	D	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

Parents, staff, students, and community members will work together to provide quality educational programs that focus on the total development of the child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Copeland, Dwayne	Principal	N/A
Glenn-Dixon, Tamla	Assistant Principal	
Schwab, Theresa	Instructional Coach	
Harvard, Tamika	Instructional Coach	
Dhawan, Kymberli	Instructional Coach	
Copelin, Anthony	Other	
Powell, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	

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	98	102	101	108	98	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	9	17	14	19	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	8	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	28	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	5	3	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

35

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	17	14	19	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	8	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	28	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	5	3	14	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	38%	56%	57%	39%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	56%	58%	45%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	46%	53%	43%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	37%	59%	63%	53%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	34%	56%	62%	55%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	15%	43%	51%	40%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	57%	53%	41%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	98 (0)	102 (0)	101 (0)	108 (0)	98 (0)	92 (0)	599 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 ()	17 ()	14 ()	19 ()	16 ()	6 ()	81 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	8 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	15 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	12 (0)	15 (0)	36 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (0)	28 (0)	43 (0)	88 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	36%	58%	-22%	58%	-22%
	2018	41%	56%	-15%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	54%	-19%	58%	-23%
	2018	35%	54%	-19%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	29%	51%	-22%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%	
	2018	32%	58%	-26%	62%	-30%	
Same Grade Comparison		11%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	32%	59%	-27%	64%	-32%	
	2018	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%	
Same Grade Comparison		-17%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					
05	2019	33%	54%	-21%	60%	-27%	
	2018	34%	57%	-23%	61%	-27%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison		-16%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	41%	56%	-15%	53%	-12%	
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	55%	-15%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	43	38	14	10	14	10				
ELL	13			40							
BLK	34	43	39	33	32	13	39				
HSP	30	30		50	64						
MUL	54	58		46	50						
WHT	51	58		43	21						
FRL	36	44	38	37	35	15	40				
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	8	15	17	5	15	16					
BLK	31	37	32	36	46	21	33				
HSP	53	50		71	42						
MUL	40	27		50	55						
WHT	45	30		35	30		46				
FRL	34	36	33	38	43	20	40				

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	8	31	38	14	31	33	23				
BLK	34	43	44	48	50	38	33				
HSP	60			73							
MUL	61	43		70	64						
WHT	44	42		56	58		60				
FRL	37	42	41	52	54	39	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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	43
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is Math Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile. The greatest contributing factor to last year's low performance in Math was due to a lack of Tier I instruction in grades 3-5.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is Math Learning Gains. The greatest contributing factor to last year's low performance in Math was due to a lack of Tier I instruction in grades 3-5.

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.

The component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is between Students with Disabilities and Student without Disabilities. The factors that contributed to the gap include:
1) teacher proficiency
2) core instruction - SWD do not have enough exposure to on grade level instruction

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is ELA Learning Gains (up 10%). The new actions taken in this are include having a Soaring Plan and having more accountability in the area of Math.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

According the EWS data, one potential area of concern is Attendance.

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

1. Math Lowest Quartile
2. Math Learning Gains
3. ELA Proficiency
4. Attendance
5. Social Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Our needs assessment analysis revealed that only 15% of the students in our lowest quartile made learning gains in math, which was below the District average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math Lowest Quartile from 15% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to John Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size.

Action Step	
Description	Our needs assessment analysis revealed that only 15% of the students in our lowest quartile made learning gains in math, which was below the District average.
Person Responsible	Tamla Glenn-Dixon (taglenn1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	Our needs assessment analysis revealed that only 38% of our students met proficiency in ELA. The percentage of students meeting proficiency in ELA was below the District and State average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA Proficiency from 38% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to John Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size.

Action Step	
Description	1. Utilize research-based resources, district support and professional learning, and Professional Learning support not provided by the district to support effective core instruction in ELA 2. Utilize district support to assist with proper implementation of new Wonders ELA program. 3. Review ELA Proficiency Data to finalize the master schedule, focusing on the proper placement of students for Interventions, ESE, and ESOL support. 4. Administer ELA I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data. 5. Conduct PLCs for ELA data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for individualized instruction. 6. Create Coaching Cycles to support Teacher Growth in small group instruction. 7. Monitor the effectiveness of small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk-throughs, feedback, and Learning Walks with coaches and teachers during core and small group instruction. 8. Learning Sciences International Leadership and Faculty Coaching and Professional Learning.
Person Responsible	Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	Our needs assessment analysis revealed that only 34% of our students made learning gains in math. The percentage of students making learning gains in math was below the District and State average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math Learning Gains from 34% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to John Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review Math Lowest Quartile Data to create the master schedule, focusing on the proper placement of students for Interventions, ESE, and ESOL support in Math. 2. Administer Math I-Ready Diagnostic Assessments to establish baseline data. 3. Utilize the Math Instructional component of iReady. 4. Conduct PLCs for Math data chats that are focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for individualized teachers and interventions. 5. Utilize Coaching Cycles to support teachers in implementing effective core and small group instruction. 6. Monitor the effectiveness of small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk-throughs, feedback, and Learning Walks with coaches and teachers during core and small group instruction. 7. Utilize research-based resources, district support and professional learning, and Professional Learning support not provided by the district to support effective small group instruction with fidelity. 8. Learning Sciences International Leadership and Faculty Coaching and Professional Learning.
Person Responsible	Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Additional School-wide Improvement Priorities include, but are not limited to, Social Emotional Learning and Attendance.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Our school's plans to build relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students include: ongoing communication through SAC and PTA, continuously publicizing events, hold grade level/subject area information nights, annual events (Meet the Teacher and Open House), hold Literacy Nights, technology nights, etc.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Counseling, mentoring, and social emotional supports are provided.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Transitional strategies are in place at the district level.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Weekly meetings.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile				$225,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	312-Subagreements greater than $25,000	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$225,000.00
			Notes: Consultants to provide, professional learning, weekly coaching for teachers including establishing classroom conditions and routines supportive of rigorous teaching and learning,			

				effective functions of PLCs focused on student evidence of learning, cognitive engagement in rigorous tasks aligned to academic standards, integrated tech tools to measure growth		
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency**				**$63,858.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$25,400.00
			Notes: Lenovo laptops for more students to access available programs provided by the district (43 laptops x $635)			
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$1,458.00
			Notes: Charging stations for laptops (2 charging stations x $730)			
	5100	510-Supplies	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$12,000.00
			Notes: iReady assessment books, small group listening center devices, materials to support small group instruction and formative assessments (write/wipe boards, vis-a-vis, high interest reading books (culturally diverse			
	5100	360-Rentals	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$20,000.00
			Notes: iReady site licensing			
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$5,000.00
			Notes: iReady training			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$290,875.75**