

Volusia County Schools

Westside Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

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: 6/4/2019

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		D	D	D

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Copeland, Dwayne	Principal	
Glenn-Dixon, Tamla	Assistant Principal	
Dhawan, Kymberli	Dean	
Schwab, Theresa	Reading Coach	
Pena, Michelle	Other	
Harvard, Tamika	Math Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/4/2019, Dwayne Copeland

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.*

0

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

575

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	81	83	86	82	101	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	35	38	45	29	48	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	15	14	20	10	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	11	17	11	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	6	8	11	3	26	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/4/2021

2020-21 - 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	99	92	86	103	100	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	35	28	20	23	25	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	14	27	14	24	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	6	14	4	5	24	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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	99	92	86	103	100	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	35	28	20	23	25	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	14	27	14	24	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	6	14	4	5	24	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				38%	56%	57%	36%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	56%	58%	35%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	46%	53%	33%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				37%	59%	63%	40%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				34%	56%	62%	44%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				15%	43%	51%	20%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				42%	57%	53%	41%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	36%	58%	-22%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	32%	59%	-27%	64%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	56%	-15%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

1st Grade - ELA and Math iReady Diagnostic Assessment

2nd Grade - ELA and Math iReady Diagnostic Assessment

3rd Grade - ELA and Math iReady Diagnostic Assessment

4th Grade - ELA and Math iReady Diagnostic Assessment

5th Grade - ELA and Math iReady Diagnostic Assessment and a combination of more than one Science assessment

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76 / 14.47%	80 / 23.75%	83 / 40.96%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72 / 13.89%	75 / 20.00%	77 / 37.66%
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 18.18%	10 / 20.00%	11 / 9.09%
	English Language Learners	blank	1 / 100.00%	1 / 100.00%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75 / 14.67%	80 / 22.50%	82 / 41.46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71 / 14.08%	75 / 20.00%	76 / 36.84%
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 10.00%	10 / 10.00%	10 / 10.00%
	English Language Learners	blank	1 / 0.00%	1 / 26.78%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75 / 10.67%	83 / 27.71%	86 / 38.37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75 / 10.67%	83 / 27.71%	84 / 38.10%
	Students With Disabilities	15 / 0.00%	13 / 0.00%	13 / 0.00%
	English Language Learners	1 / 0.00%	1 / 0.00%	2 / 50.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70 / 5.71%	83 / 10.84%	86 / 24.42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70 / 5.71%	83 / 10.84%	84 / 23.81%
	Students With Disabilities	12 / 8.33%	13 / 0.00%	13 / 0.00%
	English Language Learners	1 / 0.00%	1 / 0.00%	2 / 50.00%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77 / 31.17%	85 / 48.24%	79 / 60.76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75 / 30.67%	83 / 46.99%	77 / 59.74%
	Students With Disabilities	7 / 28.57%	9 / 22.22%	7 / 28.57%
	English Language Learners	5 / 20.00%	5 / 20.00%	5 / 20.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	76 / 11.84%	88 / 18.18%	76 / 47.37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74 / 12.16%	86 / 17.44%	74 / 48.65%
	Students With Disabilities	7 / 0.00%	7 / 28.57%	7 / 42.86%
	English Language Learners	5 / 0.00%	5 / 20.00%	5 / 40.00%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	92 / 14.13%	95 / 17.89%	98 / 18.37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	86 / 12.79%	87 / 16.09%	91 / 16.48%
	Students With Disabilities	19 / 5.26%	21 / 4.76%	21 / 4.76%
	English Language Learners	7 / 0.00%	9 / 0.00%	8 / 0.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	89 / 7.87%	96 / 9.38%	99 / 27.27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83 / 6.02%	86 / 6.82%	92 / 25.00%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 0.00%	20 / 0.00%	21 / 9.52%
	English Language Learners	7 / 0.00%	11 / 0.00%	8 / 12.50%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81 / 18.52%	84 / 27.59%	90 / 35.87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	77 / 18.18%	80 / 27.71%	82 / 34.52%
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 0.00%	11 / 0.00%	13 / 0.00%
	English Language Learners	12 / 0.00%	13 / 0.00%	13 / 0.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	81 / 9.88%	84 / 14.29%	90 / 40.00%
	Economically Disadvantaged	77 / 9.09%	80 / 12.50%	82 / 37.80%
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 0.00%	11 / 0.00%	13 / 7.69%
	English Language Learners	12 / 8.33%	13 / 7.69%	13 / 15.38%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	251 / 50%	270 / 61%	221 / 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	241 / 59%	258 / 62%	200 / 63%
	Students With Disabilities	27 / 13%	33 / 22%	30 / 20%
	English Language Learners	39 / 20%	39 / 29%	31 / 33%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8	40		8	33						
ELL	5	20		14	40						
BLK	23	42	60	26	36		44				
HSP	25	31		31	38						
MUL	27			45							
WHT	40	42		39	25		25				
FRL	26	39	44	30	32	41	38				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	293
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
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	24
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	39
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	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	34
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

We noticed a decline in the number of students proficient in ELA, Math, and Science State Assessment.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA and Math proficiency and Learning Gains

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Core Instruction, Covid, Teacher and Student Attendance, and Instructional Delivery Platform

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math Block Structure in 5th grade - We departmentalized, providing Math Intervention to all 5th grade students.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Provide additional learning opportunities to students outside of the school day, such as Virtual Saturday Tutoring and Suspended Curriculum Tutoring.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Learning on the new ELA materials and Teacher Clarity.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Progress Monitoring and providing structures - Data Chats, implement action steps
In addition, we will provide Professional Learning and follow up Coaching support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus ELA Proficiency
Description and Rationale: As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 27%, ELA Learning Gains was at 39% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 41% which was far below the district and state average. By concentrating on Proficiency this will also effect Learning Gains, Lowest Quartile, and ESSA sub-groups.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA proficiency from 27% to 38%. Increase ELA LQ learning gains from 41% to 55%.

Monitoring: Frequent data chats using district assessment data
 Learning Walks with Look-fors specific to ELA small group
 Administrative walkthroughs and feedback

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Theresa Schwab (tlschwa1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: ELA Small-group Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie, small group instruction has .49 effect size.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze baseline data to tier students for small groups. (iReady, Progress Monitoring data, and FSA)

Person Responsible Theresa Schwab (tlschwa1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide Professional Learning on the new ELA series to support small group instruction.

Person Responsible Theresa Schwab (tlschwa1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create Coaching Cycles that focus on planning and implementation of small group instruction.

Person Responsible Theresa Schwab (tlschwa1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs for ELA data chats that focus on student grouping and planning for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Theresa Schwab (tlschwa1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Learning Walks with Coaches and teachers during the ELA block.

Person Responsible Theresa Schwab (tlschwa1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize Intervention Teachers and Tutors to provide Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible Theresa Schwab (tlschwa1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor the effectiveness of small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walks-throughs and feedback.

Person Responsible Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly progress monitoring during Collaborative Planning with ESE, ELL and Intervention teachers to review data and plan for instruction.

Person Responsible Theresa Schwab (tschwa1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	Math Learning Gains and LQ
Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 31%, Math Learning Gains was at 33% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 41% which was far below the district and state average. By concentrating on the Learning Gains and the Lowest Quartile will also effect ESSA sub-groups.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Math Learning Gains from 33% to 60%. Increase Math LQ from 41% to 60%.

Monitoring: Frequent data chats using district assessment data
Learning Walks with Look-fors specific to Math
Administrative walkthroughs and feedback

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tamika Harvard (tharvard@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher Clarity (instruction and task is aligned to the standard) and Planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher clarity is both a method and a mindset, and it has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). It's teaching that is organized and intentional. When teachers engage in purposeful planning of the standards, then student growth will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze baseline data. (iReady, Progress Monitoring data, and FSA)

Person Responsible Tamika Harvard (tharvard@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Provide Professional Learning on Teacher Clarity, with an emphasis on planning.

Person Responsible Tamika Harvard (tharvard@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in planning and implementing effective Math instruction.

Person Responsible Tamika Harvard (tharvard@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Conduct Learning Walks with Coaches and teachers during the Math block.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

5. Conduct PLCs for Math data chats using the data protocol.

Person Responsible Tamika Harvard (tharvard@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Conduct monthly progress monitoring during Collaborative Planning with ESE, ELL, and Intervention teachers to review data and plan instruction and tasks that are aligned to the standard.

Person Responsible Tamika Harvard (tharvard@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. Continue weekly Collaborative Planning with emphasis on Teacher Clarity (instruction and task is aligned to the standard).

Person Responsible Tamika Harvard (tharvard@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Monitor to ensure that instruction and task is aligned to the standard through ongoing Administrative Walks-throughs and feedback.

Person Responsible Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science Proficiency
As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Science Proficiency was at 37%, which was far below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on Science proficiency for our 5th grade students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Science proficiency from 37%% to 45%.

Monitoring: VSTs
Science Topic Checks
Mid-Year SMTs
Administrative Walks-throughs and feedback

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Hands-on Science

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Psychological Science Journal, students that receive hands-on learning opportunities have shown to score an average of 7% or higher than students without hands-on learning on standardized testing.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administer the Science Standards Monitoring Test to establish baseline data.

Person Responsible Michelle Pena (mlpena@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Provide support in planning and implementing hands-on Science.

Person Responsible Michelle Pena (mlpena@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Conduct Learning Walks with teachers during the Science block.

Person Responsible Michelle Pena (mlpena@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Conduct PLCs for Science data chats that are focused on standard proficiency and remediation of Fair Game Standards.

Person Responsible Michelle Pena (mlpena@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Conduct monthly progress monitoring during Collaborative Planning with ESE, ELL, and Intervention teachers to review data and plan instruction and tasks that are aligned to the standard.

Person Responsible Michelle Pena (mlpena@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Monitor the implementation of hands-of Science including the use of Interactive Science Notebooks.

Person Responsible Michelle Pena (mlpena@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified hitting and striking as an area of concern. It is ranked as very high. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School will:

- Caring School Communities
- Social Emotional Learning Teacher on Assignments (SEL TOA)
- Peace Corners
- Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS Intervention Form)

Teachers will:

- develop clear expectations with students and other strategies to solve a conflict without fighting.
- monitor students closely when transitioning in the hallways and during recess.

Data chats will take place quarterly to discuss the above implementation plan (what's working and what's not) based on the data.

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.

Westside Elementary addresses building a positive school culture environment by ensuring that all stakeholders are involved in opportunities to provide their input. It is imperative at Westside that our staff, families, and other stakeholders know that their voice and input is a vital portion of Westside's growth and sense of community. At Westside, we understand the importance of developing and nurturing the whole child by giving each student love and an environment to feel safe. We believe in not only giving students a healthy place to learn, but also, a means to feel safe and loved.

Various platforms are offered to families and stakeholders such as the School Advisory Council (SAC), the Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and a Professional Development Schools partnership with Bethune-Cookman University. These committees engage families and stakeholders in endeavors that have a

foundation of the school's mission and vision statements that promote student development and academic achievement.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

To support students socially and emotionally in all grade levels at Westside, we have implemented the use of Caring School Communities (CSC). CSC focuses on building a classroom community in which students have a platform to initiate conversations that are solution driven and build problem solving communications. Teacher and students conduct daily classroom meetings which set a tone for daily classroom interactions, fostering peer relationships, setting a classroom culture and climate, and teach social skills. In addition, our School Counselor utilizes Sanford Harmony, a program delivered in a small group to identified students that encourages respect and empathy, promotes social-emotional development, safety and well-being, teaches self-regulatory skills and bullying prevention.

To further support Westside's commitment to building a positive school culture and environment, we have a Social Emotional Teacher on Assignment (SEL TOA). The primary focus of the SEL TOA is to support teachers in structuring a positive climate and culture within their classrooms and develop positive relationships. In addition, the SEL TOA can assist with ways to explicitly teach social-emotional skills needed for students to understand and manage their emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy, make responsible decisions and maintain positive relationships. The SEL TOA provides targeted supports for Tier II and III students that need additional supports through specific interventions.

Lastly, as a part of Westside's commitment to ensure a positive school environment, we have various programs and community initiatives to support Westside's families. These programs include Westside's Night Alive (WNA) and Food Brings Hope. WNA is a 21st Century Grant funded program that allows for the campus to open to the community surrounding Westside Elementary. Tutoring, extracurricular activities, and meals are provided to students and families. Because of these programs, fundraising and donations are supplied to Westside's families.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$144,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$110,707.00
			Notes: Intervention Teachers (2) to support lowest quartile students			
	5100	210-Retirement	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$11,978.00
			Notes: Intervention Teachers Retirement @ 10.82%			
	5100	220-Social Security	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$8,475.00
			Notes: Intervention Teachers Socials Security @ 7.65%			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$11,706.00
			Notes: Intervention Teachers Medical Insurance			

	5100	230-Group Insurance	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$73.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teachers Life Insurance @ .066%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$1,661.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teachers Workers Compensation @ 1.5%</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$83,183.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$64,409.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher to Support lowest quartile students</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$6,969.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Retirement @ 10.82%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,943.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Social Security @ 7.65%</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,853.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Medical Insurance</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$43.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Life Insurance @ .066%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$966.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Workers Compensation @ 1.5%</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$8,309.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	510-Supplies	3251 - Westside Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$8,309.50
			<i>Notes: Materials and Supplies for Professional Development</i>			
Total:						\$249,992.50