Westshore Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Westshore Elementary School

7110 S WESTSHORE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Julie Florin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	<u>Lucinda Thompson</u>
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Westshore Elementary School

7110 S WESTSHORE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	71%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

West Shore Elementary is committed to rigorous and individualized instruction in order to achieve high levels of instruction to meet students' needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Guyer, Skylaar	Principal	The principal primary responsibility as the instructional leader is to ensure teaching and learning are happening at a highly effective level everyday. Daily walkthroughs and regular feedback, along with PD are critical to achieving success for all students. Ensuring a safe and caring environment is equally critical to success and serves as a primary roll for the principal.
Larcom, Audrey	Teacher, K-12	As the SAC Chair, Audrey is responsible for leading SAC meetings and helps to ensure the SIP in implemented with fidelity.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, Julie Florin

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
27

Total number of students enrolled at the school
416

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

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	71	70	62	65	60	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	383
Attendance below 90 percent	26	27	19	15	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	28	29	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/24/2021

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				59%	52%	57%	58%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	55%	58%	61%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	50%	53%	56%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	54%	63%	51%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	57%	62%	49%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	46%	51%	33%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				46%	50%	53%	60%	51%	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	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	64%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We used the following progress monitoring tools:
iReady Reading and Math Diagnostics and Science PMAs.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57	60	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	35	51
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	7	21	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	73	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	26	42
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	10	30	50

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	73	98	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	62	75
	Students With Disabilities	72	86	95
	English Language Learners	-	102	142
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	81	91
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	38	62
	Students With Disabilities	73	80	93
	English Language Learners	-	-	57

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	87	93	107
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	66	70
	Students With Disabilities	97	100	100
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	72	97
	Economically Disadvantaged	76	92	88
	Students With Disabilities	75	85	100
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82	83	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	59	73
	Students With Disabilities	43	86	100
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51	59	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	21	43
	Students With Disabilities	41	21	38
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	84	87	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	63	74
	Students With Disabilities	64	64	78
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50	64	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	31	44
	Students With Disabilities	60	70	90
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	50	81	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	46	38
	Students With Disabilities	45	59	38
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

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	14			21							
ELL	53			26							
BLK	18			21							
HSP	55	62		43	38		47				
MUL	41			59							
WHT	81			74			70				
FRL	41	52		39	35		29				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	32	36	22	44	46	23				
ELL	48	53		35	65						
BLK	43	53	40	41	52		21				
HSP	63	63		56	70		60				
MUL	55	45		60	64						
WHT	72	56		64	56		60				
FRL	51	53	45	44	56	52	34				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	43		21	27	20					
ELL	44	50		22	30						
BLK	45	58		45	50		50				
HSP	56	68		46	48		45				
MUL	73			60							
WHT	73	58		63	55						
FRL	51	58	56	45	46	31	47				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	296

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99%

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	46
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	
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	20
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	50
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	75
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Based on the FSA, our ELA Achievement in grades 3-5 decreased from 59% proficiency in 2019 to 51% proficiency in 2021. Only 14% of our SWD students met proficiency on the 2021 FSA. Our science achievement in grade 5 decreased from 46% of students scoring a L3+ in 2019 to 38% of our students meeting proficiency.

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

Science scores were well below the state average with only 38% of students scoring a Level 3+ or higher on the Science State Assessment. Also reading proficiency decreased from 59% in 2019 to 51% proficiency in 2021.

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

We believe there is a misalignment between ELA and science assessments to classroom instruction. This year we will implement data-driven instructional techniques that proved to be successful in ELA and use them in science. For example, monthly progress monitoring with common assessments that are aligned to the rigor of the standards and allow us to analyze for misconceptions and re-teach concepts that were not mastered

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

Our ELA Gains increased from 57% in 2019 to 58% in 2021.

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

Our Reading Coach worked with multiple small groups of bottom quartile students in grades 3-5. We also utilized our ELP funds to hire a district resource teacher to work 1:1 on writing conferences and also implemented afterschool ELP for reading and writing with classroom teachers.

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

Use of scaffolding to provide on grade level text as much as possible, previewing concepts in small group instruction prior to teaching them, and consistent spiral review of concepts in order to retain learning. We will be implementing several strategies from the Driven by Data in order to provide targeted whole group and small group instruction based on assessment analysis results.

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.

Reading Coach will provide professional development and coaching cycles for our ELA teachers which will focus on acceleration in whole group and small group.
Reading Coach will meet weekly with our teachers to assist with collaborative planning.
iReady consultant will provide professional development for progress monitoring our students' growth between diagnostics.
Our area DRT for science will meet bi-weekly with our 4th and 5th grade teachers.

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

Standards based collaborative planning for teachers
Goal setting and data tracking for all students
Reading Coach support in planning with small group instruction
Frequent classroom observations with feedback cycles
Walkthroughs to provide feedback and support
ELP for grades 3-5 for Reading, Writing, Math, and Science.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Collaborative planning allows us to analyze student data from progress monitoring assessments and plan for differentiated, targeted instruction that meets the needs of all students. Collaborative planning will take place weekly by grade level and will be facilitated by the Leadership Team.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will improve from 51% to 62% as measured by the FSA assessments in May 2022.
Monitoring:	Monthly progress monitoring through common ELA and science assessments will allow us to monitor all student progress and implement necessary interventions as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Skylaar Guyer (skylaar.guyer@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data-driven instructional strategies allows us to plan for and provide targeted instruction that meets the needs of all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that data-driven instruction allows teachers to target specific needs of students and utilize strategies such as aggressive monitoring, small group instruction, spiral and reteach in order to ensure that students master content standards. We will be using the book, Driven by Data.

Action Steps to Implement

Plan and organize monthly ELA and science assessments to include:
Create a monthly assessment calendar for each grade level.
Classroom teachers will analyze assessment results and create action plans to address student learning needs.
Hold data chats and allow students to reflect on their performance.
Teachers will plan to spiral and reteach necessary standards as shown through data analysis.

Person Responsible	Skylaar Guyer (skylaar.guyer@hcps.net)

During collaborative planning we will monitor the ESSA subgroup who scored below 41% (SWD). Small group instruction will be designed around this subgroup. Additionally, informal data assessment will be monitored more frequently and instructional adjustments will be made to ensure that students with disabilities.

Person Responsible	Skylaar Guyer (skylaar.guyer@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA scores have decreased from 59% of our students being proficient in 2019 to 51% being proficient. Our goal will be to improve ELA planning and instruction in reading and writing that aligns with the state standards and best practices of literacy instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will improve from 51% to 62% as measured by the FSA in 2022.
Monitoring:	Monthly progress monitoring through common ELA assessments will allow us to monitor all student progress and implement necessary interventions as needed. Weekly administrative walkthroughs and observations with feedback cycles.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Skylaar Guyer (skylaar.guyer@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted, small group instruction that provides acceleration to students in order to address their academic needs while also maintaining high expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We know that our students' ELA proficiency decreased from 59% in 2019 to 51% in 2021. We will implement acceleration strategies to scaffold and support students in small group with grade level text in order to meet the needs while keeping high academic expectations for all.

Action Steps to Implement

Plan and organize monthly ELA assessments to include:
Create a monthly assessment calendar for each grade level.
Classroom teachers will analyze assessment results and create action plans to address student learning needs.
Hold data chats and allow students to reflect on their performance.
Teachers will plan to spiral and reteach necessary standards as shown through data analysis.

Person Responsible	Skylaar Guyer (skylaar.guyer@hcps.net)

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.

Our school ranked low for school incidents. We ranked 385 out of 1395 schools statewide and 23 out of 119 schools in the county Our school utilizes PBIS and CHAMPS behavior systems which allows us to foster a positive and safe school environment. Our school culture Insight survey data supports that we have a positive learning environment where students feel safe.

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.

At West Shore, we place a strong emphasis on a positive school culture. Our school utilizes PBIS and CHAMPS to create a culture of high expectations for positive behavior. We are also implementing Restorative Practices in our day to day interactions with students to increase a positive schoolwide culture.

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

Our guidance counselor will be modeling Restorative Practices in weekly classroom guidance. As well as, monthly Wildcat Roar celebrations for recognizing positive student character traits. All teachers participate in our schoolwide PBIS by rewarding students for modeling our schoolwide expectations - Respect, Responsibility, and Caring.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00