

Baker County School District

Westside Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Westside Elementary School

1 PANTHER CIR, Glen St Mary, FL 32040

www.bakerk12.org

Demographics

Principal: Kelley Murphy

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School 1-5 |
| 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* Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (69%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| 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 Baker 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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Westside Elementary School

1 PANTHER CIR, Glen St Mary, FL 32040

www.bakerk12.org

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School 1-5</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;">17%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Baker 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.

"Peace, Love, and Learning!"

Westside Elementary School embraces our role in developing the whole child--socially, emotionally, physically, and intellectually. We believe in our students' ability to be successful, and this belief drives our mission to educate and empower children. However, we cannot achieve this goal without the resources and support of our teachers, staff, families, and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Preparing individuals to be life-long learners, self-sufficient, and responsible citizens of good character."

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Fraser, Debbie | Principal | |
| Murphy, Kelley | Assistant Principal | |
| Miller, Suzie | School Counselor | |
| Crews, Debbie | Instructional Coach | |
| Dugger, Tabitha | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Barrett, Ashley | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Brantley, Kaley | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Sheridan, Kathy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| South, Marie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Wignall, Staci | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Rhoden, Cheryl | Other | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2018, Kelley Murphy

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

530

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

6

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

4

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 | 2 | 181 | 191 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 548 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 49 | 52 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 8 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 42 | 61 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 |

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 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

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 | 7 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/23/2022

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 | 0 | 181 | 191 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 546 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 181 | 191 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 546 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 65% | 55% | 56% | | | | 69% | 65% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | 46% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 34% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 68% | 31% | 50% | | | | 78% | 74% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | | | | 52% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 33% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | 60% | 59% | | | | | 52% | 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 | 68% | 73% | -5% | 58% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -68% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| 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 | 77% | 83% | -6% | 62% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -77% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| 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 | 16 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | 38 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | 72 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | | | 61 | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 54 | | | 43 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | | | 55 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | | | 71 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | | | 59 | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 51 | | | 58 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 46 | | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | | | 78 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | | | 73 | | | | | | | |

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 | 67 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 133 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 2 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 31 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 46 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 70 |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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?

Student attendance continues to be an issue, with many students missing 5 days or more thus far: 5 students in first grade, 8 students in second grade, 10 students in third grade. Unfortunately, the beginning of the school year is rife with illnesses, including COVID 19, in addition to other factors, such as head lice quarantines and parental ambivalence toward school attendance.

Our subgroup scores were fairly consistent except for two categories.

First, our Black Subgroup has continued to drop in Math. Our 2019 data indicates this subgroup was 75% proficiency, 2021 was 58% proficiency, and our 2022 data was 38%. This is a drop of 37 percentage points, which is significant.

The second subgroup which shows negative growth are Students with Disabilities. Our scores for this subgroup dropped from 54% proficiency to 16% proficiency, which is an alarming downward trend. We will analyze this trend and its possible factors to determine a plan for the 2022-2023 school year.

Based on discipline incidents, referrals, and district mental health/behavior personnel contacts, we have seen a continued increase in the number of students who have been recommended for social group and other district support. Many factors appear to contribute to this trend: stress of family members' COVID-related health issues, grief, fear, academic struggles, and emotional-behavioral maturity.

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

Our most urgent subgroup is our Students with Disabilities population. The drop from 54% proficiency to 16% proficiency is dramatic and must be analyzed and addressed.

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

A variety of factors contribute to the drop from 54% to 16% proficiency in reading for ESE students. A significant number of these students not only have learning disabilities, but they struggle with other issues in their lives as well, such as serious health conditions, recent loss of a caregiver, childhood trauma, transient lifestyle, long-term, poorly attended virtual school experiences, and family turmoil. Many of these same students have been retained for one or even two different school years. At least two of these ESE students withdrew from other school districts and entered Westside in late spring. Combined, these factors created quite the challenge for our teachers, support facilitators, and Title 1 instructors.

This year, Westside will continue to plan instruction for our ESE students that will help them meet their

academic goals in reading. However, the tools we've used in the past have not adequately led them to mastery, neither do the negative factors that plague these children seem to be diminishing. Therefore we need to review our current methodology. These six strategies have been proven to work with diverse groups of learners (Kameenui & Carnine, *Effective Teaching Strategies that Accommodate Diverse Learners*, 1998). All students, and particularly those with disabilities, benefit when teachers incorporate these strategies into their instruction on a regular basis:

- Focus on essentials.
- Make linkages obvious and explicit.
- Prime background knowledge.
- Provide temporary support for learning.
- Use conspicuous steps and strategies.
- Review for fluency and generalization.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math continues to be a very strong subject area for our students. There were marginal gains in FSA Math for our Students with Disabilities, White, and Free & Reduced Lunch Subgroups.

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

The teachers use center work, online games, and a comprehensive approach to teaching skills both in isolation, such as math facts, and in real world context, such as word problems. This approach helps students to use what they are learning and rationalize the purpose behind the learning.

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

2022 is the second year our district has implemented SAVVAS Learning Company's reading curriculum, and the first year of implementation for Big Ideas Math Curriculum. Our teachers will have the tools and resources provided by these research-based curricula to help support students of all skill levels. The data wall for struggling students was created by teachers early this school year, providing important information regarding those students' weaknesses and the strategies that are working and those that did not.

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.

SAVVAS & Big Ideas are providing professional development for teachers and staff on how to navigate the materials efficiently, use the online tools, and accurately assess their students in ELA and Math. WES teachers and staff will participate in Wonderful Wednesday Workshops led by our support facilitator to discuss the data wall trends and strategies to address deficits. In addition, WES in-house 'experts' will share their own successes and describe how they implemented the positive changes in their students' growth.

The NorthEast Florida Education Consortium (NEFEC) is offering training to teachers as they delve into the newest standards and the most effective instructional methods, as well as accessing our newest data system, PowerBI, which is used to examine data and extrapolate target areas of focus.

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

Third grade students on Tier 2 will be in a pull-out intervention called Reading Assistant which will help them with fluency and comprehension. First, Second, and Third grade Tier 2 students will also attend

Title 1, which is a small group pull-out intervention in which students focus on comprehension, decoding, and phonics, if necessary. WES will continue informal professional development during our Wonderful Wednesday Workshops meetings, where new strategies are discussed and shared by teachers who have used them successfully in their classrooms. These meetings are led by our Support Facilitator who oversees the data input system for student progress.

Data Chats are conducted each 9 weeks and provide the opportunity for teachers to sit with the administrators, guidance personnel, instructional coach, and support facilitator to discuss each child and make decisions regarding their progress and possible interventions.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Our most urgent subgroup is our Students with Disabilities population. There was a significant drop in the SWD on the FSA ELA. The drop from 54% proficiency to 16% proficiency is dramatic and must be analyzed and addressed. Many of these students face obstacles which hinder their success, but one of the most impactful is excessive truancy. When students are not at school, then none of the instructional plans that are created will help those students improve! Our plan for improvement of this subgroup must include both academic support and attendance motivators. As part of our beginning-year data, our students have taken the STAR ELA. Out of 27 third grade ESE students, 33% of them reached the 50% percentile of proficiency.

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

In order to address the ESE deficit score, support facilitation will implement a comprehensive plan to (1) individualize instruction that follows the IEP, (2) train teachers/paras in specific strategies to address learning gaps, (3) use data chats to keep instructional support on target, (4) add another support facilitator assistant to help more students, (5) check attendance records weekly and establish a system of rewards. Using a comprehensive plan of instruction that includes all of the above components, third grade ESE students in general education/inclusion classrooms will improve from 33% to 50% proficiency.

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

Individualized Instruction, Teacher Training, Data Chats regarding ESE students, Attendance Check-In with Rewards

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Rhoden (cheryl.rhoden@bakerk12.org)

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

Students who attend school 'all day, every day' each week will receive a special attendance reward. Research shows that parents need to be partnered with schools to stress the importance of school attendance. Rewarding students is a good way to demonstrate that our school values student attendance and appreciate families who make it a priority.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A study conducted by the National Center on Educational Outcomes found that elementary school students with disabilities served by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) were 1.5 times as likely to be chronically absent as their peers without disabilities. Encouraging attendance through praise and tangible rewards should decrease truancy and help those ESE students' academics improve.

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.

Student check-in for attendance; rewards given for weekly attendance

Person Responsible Cheryl Rhoden (cheryl.rhoden@bakerk12.org)

Student's IEP Goals monitored

Person Responsible Cheryl Rhoden (cheryl.rhoden@bakerk12.org)

STAR administered and analyzed

Person Responsible Debbie Crews (debra.crews@bakerk12.org)

#2. 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.

ELA proficiency for all three grade levels is always a concern, as the first STAR test is usually alarming in pure numbers. Therefore, testing is done very early upon the students' return so that teachers are able to formulate a plan for each student during the subsequent Data Chats.

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

If we provide strategic standards-based instruction in ELA, then student achievement will increase: 1.) First grade will increase the percentage of students proficient on final STAR Reading Test from 60% to 70%. 2.) Second grade will increase the percentage of students proficient on final STAR Reading Test from 48% to 60%. 3.) Third grade will increase the percentage of students proficient on the STAR Reading Test from 48% to 70%.

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

The STAR will be administered three times during the school year. The testing is followed by a Data Chat with each teacher where every student is discussed in terms of progress, necessary interventions or enrichment, and behavior. STAR data is uploaded into a Google Doc that serves as an online Data Wall.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Rhoden (cheryl.rhoden@bakerk12.org)

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

SAVVAS is research-based instruction from the Pearson Company. Teachers are given ongoing professional training on how to utilize this new curriculum to its maximum potential. Data Chats and Data Walls are also supported by research as effective ways to monitor student progress and make decisions that positively impact learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

SAVVAS curriculum was recommended by our consortium and selected by our district elementary teachers after a thorough vetting process. Our district elementary teachers have had a year to explore this new series and discover how it supports students of all learning levels. Year 2 of the SAVVAS adoption should demonstrate that teachers have mastered many of its resources and are using its varied materials to help struggling students, enrich advanced learners, and provide authentic learning opportunities to all students.

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.

STAR given three times per school year. These assessments are scheduled in advance and coordinate with other district elementary schools.

Person Responsible Debbie Crews (debra.crews@bakerk12.org)

Data Chats after STAR.

Person Responsible Debbie Crews (debra.crews@bakerk12.org)

Data Wall, MTSS process (if necessary), general strategies for instruction.

Person Responsible Cheryl Rhoden (cheryl.rhoden@bakerk12.org)

Lesson plans will be created using SAVVAS to address new learning, remediation, practice, and enrichment. Teachers will use their curriculum as a basis for teaching, adding other components as they feel comfortable. Lesson plans will be turned in to administration three times per school year for inspection.

Person Responsible Debbie Fraser (deborah.fraser@bakerk12.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

N/A

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.

In order for a school to function efficiently and enrich those on its campus, there must be a continued effort to build relationships among staff members. Westside Elementary School's strategies to encourage positive working relationships between teachers include grade level teams sharing common planning times, grade-level team times, cross grade-level meetings, time set aside for Curriculum Mapping, weekly team meetings, monthly team leader meetings, teacher inquiry, district-wide collaboration, planned professional development opportunities, shared decision making in curriculum programs, other school programs and school activities, beginning teacher program, opportunities for modeling/visiting other classrooms, and instructional coach, school counselor, Title 1 Team, school facilitator and leadership team support. Our staff is treated to a luncheon plus a gift during teacher pre-planning week, in addition to various meals, recognitions, and others goodies during the school year. Our Panther Team remembers individuals with a

card on their birthday, and if the staff member experiences serious illness or a death in the immediate family, the Panther Team sends flowers as a form of solace.

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

The school builds and sustains partnerships with our local community for the purpose of securing and utilizing resources to support the school and student achievement. The Baker Prevention Coalition attends our Title 1/School Advisory Council and provide backpacks for needy students. The local Women's Club provides school supplies, and area churches will donate clothes for our students who need them. The local thrift store, known as "Rack Up", uses proceeds to donate money to district schools for projects that directly impact student needs. Area businesses provide grant money to enrich science and math. A chapter of local veterans have given benches for teachers and students to enjoy during recess. A local ophthalmologist provides free eye exams and glasses to students that need them.

Westside hosts the annual Project REACH (Reading Embraces All Children) where community members are invited to classrooms to read a story and spend time with the children.