

Duval County Public Schools

Westside High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	26

Westside High School

5530 FIRESTONE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32244

<http://www.duvalschools.org/westside>

Demographics

Principal: Vincent Foster

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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* Asian Students* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Duval 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	11
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Westside High School

5530 FIRESTONE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32244

<http://www.duvalschools.org/westside>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">85%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

Westside High School is committed to increasing student achievement through high quality standards based instruction, modeling integrity, and preparation for post secondary learning and experiences, for each student, in every classroom, daily.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Each student will complete their high school experience with an ideal career plan, to include a post-secondary focus of study or vocational track in their career of choice, in order to become productive citizens.

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
Goodwin, Jamelle	Principal	Oversee the school's day to day operations such as logistics, schedules, teacher and staff evaluations, and public relations. Delegate tasks to the Assistant Principal that assist with the balancing of priorities.
Hall, Sabrina	Assistant Principal	Assist with the monitoring of daily operations, acting building leader in the absence of the Principal. Monitor and support the assigned content area departments, ensuring that daily logistics and operations run smoothly. Support all stakeholders through actively listening, problem solving and data.
Richardson, Stephen	Assistant Principal	Monitor and adjust school master schedule, ensuring that all students are properly scheduled in the correct courses needed to obtain a high school diploma. Monitoring and supporting the guidance department as lead administrator. Supporting assigned content area courses.
Colson, Kalynda	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach supports teachers by helping with the “how” of teaching. She collaborates with teachers in designing instruction to meet the needs of all students, through multiple strategies. The coach also coordinates with other specialists in the school to provide a seamless approach to the educational processes in the school, supporting the idea that literacy is a process, not content. The coach maintains confidentiality and be responsive to the “territorial” limitations of teachers’ classrooms.
Bunche-King, Mykeshia	Math Coach	The Math coach supports the Math department by helping with the “what” of teaching. She helps teachers use the state and district curriculum standards to plan instruction and assessment. The coach collaborates and supports teachers in using the curriculum to analyze students’ strengths and target areas for improvement. The Math Coach demonstrates how curriculum is structured, i.e., thematic approaches, etc., and validate the content teachers’ expertise, tapping into the content expertise of the classroom teacher.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Vincent Foster

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,464

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

2

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

3

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	413	472	319	271	1475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	112	84	346
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	77	49	37	272
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	95	41	32	221
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	108	57	26	338
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196	176	168	171	711
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	182	123	116	697

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	73	18	10	135
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	56	43	29	164

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/12/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	515	420	302	316	1553
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	198	148	515
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	84	56	49	294
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	93	40	2	176
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	63	41	14	233
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	186	160	105	683

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	106	36	9	186
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	87	43	49	247

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	515	420	302	316	1553
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	198	148	515
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	84	56	49	294
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	93	40	2	176
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	63	41	14	233
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	186	160	105	683

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	106	36	9	186
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	87	43	49	247

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				24%	47%	56%	27%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				32%	48%	51%	41%	49%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	42%	42%	32%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				45%	51%	51%	45%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains				44%	52%	48%	56%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	47%	45%	45%	50%	45%
Science Achievement				44%	65%	68%	43%	61%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				48%	70%	73%	55%	67%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	19%	48%	-29%	55%	-36%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	24%	48%	-24%	53%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	41%	67%	-26%	67%	-26%	

CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019						

HISTORY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	47%	68%	-21%	70%	-23%	

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	36%	57%	-21%	61%	-25%	

GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	61%	-12%	57%	-8%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The tool used to gather and compile the data below is SAS systems, which is a data storage tool/app that our district uses to store, project, and retrieve final test scores. One of our primary sources of progress monitoring data compiled in SAS is the Progress Monitoring Assessments which are conducted 3 times a school year (September, December, April)

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26.29	23..28	14.51
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.9	21.05	12.5
	Students With Disabilities	11.11	13.73	1.82
	English Language Learners	7.69	14.29	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60.61	59.09	51.35
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.33	33.33	0
	Students With Disabilities	83.33	42.86	28.57
	English Language Learners	100	33.33	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35.09	19.44	17.96
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.24	25	0
	Students With Disabilities	10.42	11.63	18.75
	English Language Learners	2.38	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35.09	31.93	26.09
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	42.86	0
	Students With Disabilities	25	23	11.43
	English Language Learners	26.92	22	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	25.0	23.57	23.81
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.86	16.67	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	21.43	26.67	0
	English Language Learners	28.57	18.18	5.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	47.5	39.13	47.02
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	100	100	100
	English Language Learners	0	16.67	0

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	0	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60.0	33	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	50	33	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	27	22	8
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	16	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	22	17	0
	English Language Learners	28	18	5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	30	37	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	16	100
	Students With Disabilities	18	25	16
	English Language Learners	5	9	12

Grade 12					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		0	n/a	0
	Economically Disadvantaged		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities		n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities		n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		25	19	23
	Economically Disadvantaged		26	23	27
	Students With Disabilities		n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners		0	0	n/a
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		50	45	46
	Economically Disadvantaged		33	25	36
	Students With Disabilities		n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners		100	50	n/a
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	19	22	29	39	27	31	27	47		94	58
ELL	8	27	27	17	46	53	24	19		94	77
ASN	36	30		45							
BLK	16	30	43	27	27	31	19	38		92	75
HSP	18	28	24	29	41	50	29	40		87	85

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
MUL	18	36		28	33		38	55			
WHT	31	35	33	31	20	18	55	57		86	86
FRL	15	28	37	25	26	34	23	34		89	78
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	28	31	38	47	45	60	41	38		95	87
ELL	3	34	34	35	42		15	33		88	96
BLK	20	30	32	41	43	32	40	45		97	91
HSP	21	33	39	38	56		27	42		89	91
MUL	50	32		63			60				
WHT	38	36	33	56	39	18	64	68		91	94
FRL	21	30	32	42	40	27	42	46		95	89
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	26	40	33	40	44	23	43	45		85	63
ELL	9	29	27	29	64		31	17			
BLK	22	38	34	42	56	47	36	49		94	85
HSP	26	36	25	36	49		48	64		78	89
MUL	50	57		67	69		82	70		100	82
WHT	51	58	33	63	57	30	64	66		89	88
FRL	25	40	33	43	58	46	41	52		92	84

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	84%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	40
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	37
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	35
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	45
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	39
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?

The data trends lower through out the school year. Students performed higher during the Fall assessment window than in the Spring. 9th Grade English Language Learners remained consistent in Math performance.

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

The greatest need of improvement would be 9th grade Reading. Students showed a decline through the previous school year, while the 2019 FSA data showed a proficiency rate of 19%, 10th grade faired at 24%.

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

Students are transitioning to another environment, which is less contained than Middle School. The level of the Reading standards increase, and task demands become more analytical. Students must build stamina for Reading and processing information. The school will implement a school wide literacy plan with the support of the Reading and Reading Interventionist.

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

Biology and US History were the two areas that had the greatest improvement for the progress monitoring assessments. The school will continue to focus on Biology and US History, and the detailed instruction aligned to the grade level standards. Students will be familiar with the questions and complexity of questions through out the year.

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

Teachers completed an aligned standards review within each others classes to compare the level of instruction. Teachers participated in Professional learning to analyze the standards and develop lessons aligned to the standards and learning patterns/demands of the aligned tasks. Analysis of

student product was conducted to determine if students were achieving mastery. This process was completed quarterly.

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

Instruction and tasks must be aligned to the intended grade level standards. Checks for understanding and mastery should be assessed through out the lesson, with the implementation of FSA aligned exit tickets.

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.

Teachers will participate in quarterly TDE trainings to allow time to fully assess student process through the use of the Equip Protocol and Student Work Analysis. During monthly Early Release In Service days, teachers will participate in content and school wide data analysis sessions to understanding how to read data and plan for effective next steps based on the deficits trends that are observed.

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

To sustain student achievement and teacher progress, these strategies will be embedded in the academic culture of the school. These practices will be implemented annually and become a part of the work in the PLC weekly.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based upon the Instructional observation data and teacher evaluations, a more strategic focus has to be placed on standards aligned instruction. Students MUST be taught at grade level using resources that align with the grade level standard. Instruction MUST align with the appropriate levels of the Achievement Level Descriptors (3, 4 and 5) to meet the growth and/or proficiency target for students. Title 1 funds will be utilized as an additional layer of support to students by funding the following positions (Mathematics Social Studies, Science, Reading Interventionist Math Interventionist, Math Coach). The additional positions will assist in ensuring student growth and ultimate proficiency. Title I funds will be used to purchase additional classroom supplies including, but not limited to paper, pencils, and materials for teacher/student use in improving student achievement.

Title I funds will also be used to purchase additional student laptops and carts to be used during instruction as well as testing to help students access the district approved blended learning platforms and to enhance overall instructional delivery.

Measurable Outcome: Assessment data should reveal how well students have learned, and what we want them to learn, while the level of instruction ensures this happens. The outcome is assessment data showing an increase in mastery over time, student awareness of learning objectives, and instructional strategies closely aligned to the standard which become embedded in student practice.

Monitoring: This will be monitored through weekly walk through using the district tracker for standards aligned instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sabrina Hall (halls3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: All Teachers will participate in weekly PLC lead by the Instructional Coach or Math Coach and Administrator for that content. identify components which is essential to unpacking the standards during in a professional learning community, and in class with students to understand the expectations for learning and mastery. Teacher understanding of the elements of the standard, and practice with students will increase student engagement and ownership, as they understand the purpose for learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As shared in Danielson's framework for Effective Teaching, standards include academic language to describe the quality, direction and complexity of student learning and work produced. It is a crucial component of instructional delivery, in order to strengthen student understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor teacher active participation in weekly PLC and Common Planning. Ensure that agenda and activities include unpacking standards, determining placement of instruction within the learning arc, planning effective lessons that fully align to the grade level standard.

Person Responsible Sabrina Hall (halls3@duvalschools.org)

Implement weekly classroom walks to monitor the progress of instruction that is fully aligned to the standard, the activities implemented for students and the assessment data for the taught standard.

Person Responsible Jamelle Goodwin (wilcoxj1@duvalschools.org)

Analysis of student work in Professional Learning community to determine if student performance is at least at the ALD 3 or above. The misconceptions of students will be determined, as the Instructional Coach or Math Coach will assist in planning alternative activities to help students achieve mastery.

Person Responsible Kalynda Colson (colsonk1@duvalschools.org)

Title I funds will be used to provide our faculty summer training in planning for best standards and culturally responsive teaching, as we continue to align with Standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Sabrina Hall (halls3@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

With an enrollment of approximately 1500 students, a more strategic process is needed to monitor instruction for targeted groups. Graduation Coach will be funded with Title I to improve student engagement in the classroom and target growth in meeting graduation requirements. Title I funds will also be used to provide students with a field experience to visit Colleges and University to gain real-world experience and self-reflection. The progression for the Math courses has been adjusted to meet the academic needs of all students, with an increase of students still needing to meet a Math graduation requirement. Reading requirements has been a deficit for students as a graduation requirement. While more students generate growth than proficiency. Through the use of the Math Interventionist and Reading Interventionist, the school will provide aligned, purposeful support to students within small group settings. The interventionist will push in to classes weekly, and facilitate small group learning sessions for students needing to pass the Geometry EOC, 11th and 12th graders needing to satisfy the Reading requirement for graduation, and students targeted for growth.

Measurable Outcome:

There will be an increase in Seniors meeting their Math and Reading requirement prior to graduation deadline. Students Reading growth and LPQ Reading data will increase, thus increasing the overall data performance within the accountability scoring in the areas of Reading Gains, LPQ Reading, Math gains, LPQ Math and graduation rate. With the implementation of testing support and college tours, students will be more reflective about their post-secondary choices and plans.

Monitoring:

Using Title I funds to purchase the Reading and Math Interventionist positions, the interventionists will be supporting students in small groups. The Graduation Coach position purchased with Title I funds, will monitor the progress of the 11th and 12th grade students still needing concordance. The desired outcome progress will be monitored through the use of progress monitoring assessments embedded within the district curriculum, the use of remediated instruction within small groups, and data analysis of practice ACT/ SAT assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Richardson (richardsons3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Small group instruction is effective because teaching is focused precisely on what the students need to learn next to move forward. Ongoing observation of your students, combined with systematic assessment enables you to draw together groups of students who fit a particular instructional profile.- Fountas and Pinnell

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

If the school's goal is to foster development in struggling students for Reading and Math, opportunities must be provided for students to work within a setting that will allow them to focus, and to receive direct support with out the distractions in a traditional setting.

Action Steps to Implement

Title I funds will be used to provide additional core subject area teachers (Science, Reading, and Math) for providing students with more individualized support and small group instruction.

Based upon the graduation tracking tool, Administration will create specific schedules of support for the following:

Pull out instruction and support for the Reading Interventionist to begin instruction based on the 12th grade students who have not met the Reading requirement for graduation.

Pull out instruction and support for the Math Interventionist to begin targeted support based on 12th grade students who have yet to meet the Math testing requirement.

Person Responsible Jamelle Goodwin (wilcoxj1@duvalschools.org)

Following the October FTE, Administration will analyze the student data to determine the LPQ students for Reading and Math. Interventionists will collaborate with admin to determine a schedule of support to push into classrooms for weekly support of LPQ students.

Person Responsible Sabrina Hall (halls3@duvalschools.org)

Quarterly, track and monitor the achievement data for each group to determine progress and next steps.

Person Responsible Mykeshia Bunche-King (bunchem@duvalschools.org)

Support will be provided to students via the Admin team and Interventionists, to engage with professionals from various industries to familiarize students with the options for post-secondary planning. Students will participate in college tours, funded through Title I and interactive seminars to learn details and steps taken to pursue their intended goals.

Person Responsible Stephen Richardson (richardsons3@duvalschools.org)

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.

A Dean of Students position will be funded with Title I to improve student engagement in the classroom and reduce classroom distractions and suspension rates, to better implement restorative practices. Based upon the data from 2019-2020, an area of concern that will be thoroughly monitored in the 2021-2022 school year is the suspension rate. The school was under different leadership, and experiencing a culture transition. Westside High School will focus on peer mediation, response to interventions and other restorative practices to build communication ability in students. When student are able to communicate their feelings and be receptive of peer feedback, problems can be resolved. As we are shaping the future business leaders, and citizens, students must be taught effective social skills. If incidents can be prevented before they occur, the suspension rate will decline.

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.

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. Westside continues to embrace the community in which we service, striving for academic excellence in a cultural responsive manner. Westside welcomes the input, support and feedback from all stakeholders, as we align to be a village for all students. Parents and students may have had a difficult time, in the past, being seen and heard.

Through the use of our Social Media platforms and Parent Messenger system, Westside will continue to improve communication of events, academic opportunities and support resources available to students and stakeholders.

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

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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00