

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Westshore Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Westshore Elementary School

7110 S WESTSHORE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Julie Florin

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (46%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* 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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Westshore Elementary School

7110 S WESTSHORE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 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;">72%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	B	B

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 achievement to meet the needs of all students..

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Guyer, Skylaar	Principal	The principal's primary responsibility as an 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.
Ellinger, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	As the SAC Chair, Betsy is responsible for leading SAC meetings and helps to ensure the SIP is implemented with fidelity.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/12/2022, Julie Florin

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

29

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

388

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

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	55	66	62	48	66	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
Attendance below 90 percent	25	20	16	20	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	2	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	24	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	7	6	9	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	3	2	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0	0	0	
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

Monday 8/15/2022

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	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	

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	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 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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	53%	56%				59%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						57%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						48%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	56%	50%	50%				53%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	46%						61%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						52%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	59%	59%				46%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	39	28		39	56	50					
ELL	67			69							
BLK	34	50	57	35	31	24	8				
HSP	68	52		67	64		33				
MUL	44	35		44	35		18				
WHT	78	72		71	50		53				
FRL	50	53	46	46	43	38	23				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
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	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 Math Achievement in grades 3-5 decreased from 49% proficiency in 2021 to 37% proficiency in 2022. Only 42% of our SWD students met proficiency on the 2022 FSA. Our science achievement in grade 5 decreased from 38% of students scoring a L3+ in 2021 to 30% of our students meeting proficiency in 2022. Only 34% of our black students and 35% of our multiracial students met proficiency on the 2022 FSA.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Science scores were well below the state average with only 30% of students scoring a Level 3+ or higher on the Science State Assessment. Science proficiency decreased from 38% in 2021 to 30% proficiency in 2022. Also math proficiency decreased from 49% in 2021 to 37% proficiency in 2022.

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 prove 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our ELA overall achievement increased from 51% in 2021 to 57% in 2022.

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

Our Leadership Team held a "Bottom Quartile Lunch Bunch" to review data with students every Friday during the student's lunchtime. The 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 math 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 3rd - 5th grades in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our ELA proficiency scores for our black students was 34%, multiracial 35%, and SWD 42% in 2022. Our goal will be to improve our ELA proficiency scores to above the state average of 50% or more. This will occur through ELA planning and instruction in reading and writing that aligns with the state standards and best practices of literacy instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA proficiency will improve from 57% to 62% as measured by the FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

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:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We know that our black, multiracial, and SWD students' ELA proficiency was below the state's average of 50% on the FSA 2022. We will implement acceleration strategies to scaffold and support these 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA proficiency will improve from 51% to 62% as measured by the FSA assessments in May 2022.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

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:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

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