Westchester Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Westchester Elementary School

12405 ROYAL PALM BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33065

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Geraine

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

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)	57%
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: A (66%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (61%)
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 Broward 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

Westchester Elementary School

12405 ROYAL PALM BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33065

[no web address on file]

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	52%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

The Philosophy of Westchester Elementary School is to foster the development of each child to his/her greatest potential. All faculty and staff members have a basic responsibility to create an environment conducive to learning, and to provide necessary opportunities for learning to take place. Westchester Elementary School is dedicated to providing excellence in education through innovation; to instill a life-long love of learning in students and teachers; and to celebrating diversity within a caring environment. Westchester will nurture competent and thoughtful citizens who are positively engaged in the making of the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We use the same Vision Statement as our District:
Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world

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
Frame Geraine, Melissa	Principal	Instructional leader who oversees the daily operation of the school.
Goodman, Avis	Assistant Principal	Maintains the safety and security of all staff and students. Conducts teacher oservations and data chats. Supervises all staff members.
Hartner, William	Assistant Principal	Maintains the safety and security of all staff and students. Conducts teacher oservations and data chats. Supervises all staff members.
Weston, Gabriella	SAC Member	5th grade teacher and SAC Chair. Responsible for instructing her students by following the Florida Standards. Also conducts and oversees monthly SAC meetings, ensures that SAC requirements are met and assist with completing the School Improvement Plan and sharing information with our stakeholders.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2010, Melissa Geraine

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.*

6

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,093

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

5

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

5

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	43	27	17	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	14	16	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	7	1	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	145	185	174	173	187	209	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1073
Attendance below 90 percent	30	31	23	27	31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	35	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	31	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	2	11	36	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	145	185	174	173	187	209	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1073
Attendance below 90 percent	30	31	23	27	31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	35	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	31	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	2	11	36	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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				74%	59%	57%	75%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	60%	58%	70%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	54%	53%	54%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	65%	63%	75%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				71%	66%	62%	67%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	53%	51%	50%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				69%	46%	53%	69%	49%	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	71%	60%	11%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	62%	9%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	59%	14%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	65%	8%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	67%	8%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	64%	4%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	66%	49%	17%	53%	13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

IReady Assessments for ELA and Math and School City Assessments for Science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	56%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	39%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	16%	20%	28%
	English Language Learners	41%	35%	48%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	39%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	29%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	20%	32%
	English Language Learners	30%	29%	39%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58%	60%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	46%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	20%	25%
	English Language Learners	36%	47%	55%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37%	41%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	21%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	11%	20%
	English Language Learners	19%	17%	35%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68%	75%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	45%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	12%	17%
	English Language Learners	26%	47%	56%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36%	50%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	25%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	12%	18%
	English Language Learners	9%	19%	23%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53%	57%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	37%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	6%	21%
	English Language Learners	32%	37%	39%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	51%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	25%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	16%	22%
	English Language Learners	11%	26%	45%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36%	48%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	23%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	15%	18%
	English Language Learners	15%	22%	31%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	44%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	19%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	8%	19%
	English Language Learners	7%	18%	35%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43%	45%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	25%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	15%	20%	22%
	English Language Learners	35%	38%	40%

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	30	27	13	27	31	35	20				
ELL	55	50	36	46	43	21	40				
ASN	85			86			73				
BLK	49	46	19	31	23	18	21				
HSP	64	43	33	50	34	31	32				
MUL	74			61							
WHT	72	51	36	62	37	17	58				
FRL	53	39	24	34	25	15	22				
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	31	42	38	36	59	50	27				
ELL	66	65	62	75	76	50	55				

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
ASN	92	84		97	97		87				
BLK	67	67	48	65	66	50	62				
HSP	68	63	51	72	66	46	60				
MUL	85	83		78	89						
WHT	80	74	68	81	71	40	81				
FRL	66	67	55	67	68	49	58				

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	32	48	52	42	52	48	44				
ELL	73	80	67	70	68	60	61				
ASN	82	80		89	86		79				
BLK	67	68	47	67	63	50	63				
HSP	74	72	53	70	62	41	66				
MUL	80	73		76	70						
WHT	80	66	61	82	68	56	72				
FRL	67	68	50	67	63	47	61				

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	335
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
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	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	68
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	48
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	33
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?

Our SWD students in all grade levels in both ELA and Math performed below 40% in each period tested (fall, winter, and spring)

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

Science. 69% of our students showed proficiency in Science on the state assessment. We saw a decline in Science scores on 2021 Science Assessment. Our scores went from 69% to 36% proficiency.

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

Due to the pandemic and schools being held virtually from March 2020 to October 2020. Our students were all learning online. Most of our SWD students continued online learning and did not return to the school building during 2020 - 2021 school year

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

ELL students showed growth from 2018 to 2019 in areas of math achievement level and learning gains.

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

Our ELL students participated in afterschool ESOL camps and also utilized Imagine Learning which is a digital literacy and math program designed to help students improve foundational skills.

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

Continue to use Imagine Learning and we will continue with afterschool ESOL camps.

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.

All grade level teachers participated in school PLC's as well as District Professional development trainings in Reading and Math.

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

Continue to use Imagine Learning and we will continue with afterschool ESOL camps. Also, students are receiving small group instruction with ESSER Coaches who are targeting students performing below grade level in Reading and Math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Less than 41% of our SWD students met proficiency on State Assessment FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	On 2022 FSA, 45% of our SWD students will meet proficiency.
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored with the use of IReady, Reading Pus and Benchmark Advance Intervention Tool kits.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Benchmark Advance Intervention Toolkit supports ESE and resource teachers with highly focused instruction. Scaffolds and supports achievement of grade level expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Resources that are being used by the district to support BEST standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly reviews and scaffolding lessons,
2. Unit assessment at the end of five weeks.
3. Cycle assessment using School City
Each action step is monitored by Literacy Coach, Curriculum Coaches and Administration.

Person Responsible Avis Goodman (avis.goodman@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Westchester reports 0.1 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls in the very low category. Westchester also falls in the very low category in suspensions with zero out of school or in-school suspensions last school year.
We hold school-wide and grade level behavior assemblies at the start of each year. We also have a school wide incentive program used to recognize students caught doing good. We use a program called Suite 360 which is a Social Emotional Learning platform that all grade levels use to teach lesson pertaining to having good character and how to deal with social issues. We are also a No Place for Hate School. Our behavior data is monitored monthly.

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.

Although we were faced with the challenge of a pandemic, Westchester continued to build positive culture and environment. We had to think outside of the box to keep our families involved. We continued to have family engagement activities, however, they were held virtually. Our families participated in a Winter Wonderland Drive by parade and our students had virtual dance parties. We get information out regarding our school events by using a variety of modalities such as our school newsletter, school website, marquee and social media.

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

We have a very active PTA. Our PTA assists us in planning family events and they also volunteer during these events. Our parents are welcome to volunteer at our school in the classrooms fostering an inclusive and welcoming environment. Our families are warmly greeted in our car line daily as well as in our front office. Our parents are also actively involved in the School Improvement process by being members of our School Advisory Committee.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$17,225.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	539-Technology-Related Periodicals	2681 - Westchester Elementary School	Title, I Part A	106.0	$17,225.00
			Notes: School Licenses for Reading Plus, Imagine Math, School City and Suite 360			
					Total:	$17,225.00