

Duval County Public Schools

Westside Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Westside Middle School

4815 WESCONNETT BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

www.duvalschools.org/wms

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Westside Middle School is to achieving an educational standard of excellence as our chief priority for all students. To accomplish this goal, we will provide a calm, safe, and respectful school climate. Working in collaboration, the faculty, staff, parents, and community will ensure that all students achieve their academic, social, and physical potential to become productive citizens and lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Westside Middle School will provide an engaging curriculum that will motivate students to reach their full potential in a safe, nurturing environment.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Errico, David	Principal	Will oversee and monitor all areas of the school. Instructional leader of the school. Present the mid year stakeholder data in Jan/Feb of each year.
	Assistant Principal	Principal Designee, APC, will oversee PD, Math, ESE, Electives
Johnson, Gloria	Other	Math Interventionist, Oversee math department, PLC, Ignite, tutoring, assist with testing
Johnson, Ciera	Dean	Dean of Academics, Oversee SS, PLC, Testing designee, student progression/tracking
Ricks, Joanne	Other	Reading Interventionist, oversee ELA, Reading, PLC, Assist with new teacher training, assistance with tutoring and attendance monitoring.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School Leadership worked together to identify the areas of regression, growth, and potential areas of improvement. The team worked to identify areas with obtainable goals. SAC meetings helped inform the community of our plan and provided an opportunity for their voice and impact.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We will monitor these goals at Leadership meetings, District LEAD meetings, District Instructional Reviews, Mid Year SAC, SAC Meetings, and during PLC. During the year we will track progress to ensure we are making grounds towards our goal and improvement.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	86%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	74	57	150
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	13	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	129	113	341
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	122	86	291
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	148	116	353

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	8	25

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	79	76	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	46	35	148
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	89	150	369
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	15	5	96
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	96	102	326
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	102	91	291
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	37	27	99

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	33	44	97

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	79	76	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	46	35	148
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	89	150	369
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	15	5	96
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	96	102	326
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	102	91	291
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	37	27	99

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	33	44	97

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	8	25

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	25	42	49	24	43	50	22		
ELA Learning Gains				38			29		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			27		
Math Achievement*	28	49	56	30	35	36	26		
Math Learning Gains				44			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			30		
Science Achievement*	21	48	49	22	48	53	21		
Social Studies Achievement*	41	66	68	56	53	58	43		
Middle School Acceleration	60	82	73	74	47	49	52		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	18	31	40	36	85	76	50		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	193
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	4
ELL	17	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	21	Yes	2	1
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	29	Yes	3	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	3	3
ELL	38	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	2	
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	38	Yes	2	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	25			28			21	41	60			18
SWD	16			14			13	32			4	
ELL	11			22			0	36			5	18
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21			23			17	40	63		5	
HSP	20			24			7	35			5	19
MUL	52			43							2	
PAC												
WHT	40			44			42	47	67		5	
FRL	23			26			18	35	56		6	14

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	24	38	39	30	44	43	22	56	74			36
SWD	14	30	31	19	36	36	23	38				
ELL	15	41	56	29	58	58	15	33				36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	33	33	23	39	42	19	50	67			
HSP	20	37	50	36	45	40	19	58				37
MUL	41	55		45	55		27	75				
PAC												
WHT	50	50	50	49	50	36	45	81	75			
FRL	21	33	36	28	40	38	23	53	69			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	22	29	27	26	26	30	21	43	52			50
SWD	14	28	27	15	24	21	9	25				
ELL	18	48	47	31	42		18	50				50
AMI												
ASN	50	60		70	70							
BLK	18	26	24	20	21	24	17	33	49			
HSP	23	44	41	29	39	50	19	50				47
MUL	28	21		23	29							
PAC												
WHT	36	27		44	32		34	64	61			
FRL	19	29	26	23	28	30	15	41	51			40

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	27%	40%	-13%	47%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	22%	41%	-19%	47%	-25%
06	2023 - Spring	18%	38%	-20%	47%	-29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	14%	43%	-29%	54%	-40%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	40%	-2%	48%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	27%	45%	-18%	55%	-28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	13%	35%	-22%	44%	-31%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	52%	18%	50%	20%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	64%	17%	63%	18%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	63%	-25%	66%	-28%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performance was 6th grade math with a drop from 25% to 14% last year. There were 2 positions. 1 was a vacancy all year. The other was held by a 1st year teacher who was a non education background long term sub and struggled greatly with Classroom management and lesson planning.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

6th Grade math also showed one of the largest declines from the previous year. The factors above were the greatest contributor. There was also a vacancy in Algebra 1 for half for the school year and the two holes in math affected PLC and common planning.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The largest gap was also our 6th grade math. District average was 43% and state was 55%. Our 6th grade students not only have vacancies in math during the year but also had vacancy in science, an elective, and part of the year social studies. A lack of consistency and teaching across the grade affected students in all areas.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

7th grade math made a large improvement from 23% to 38%. We had two very strong teachers who did consistent pull outs, standard aligned lessons, and high structure in their classes all year. There were no vacancies in the math 7th grade department. A small portion of students who were originally scheduled into Algebra as 7th graders were struggling at the time of the mid term. We moved students to 7th grade math which would allow them another year to prepare for Algebra and bettered their chances for proficiency.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our students in the ESOL category and our minority students are impacted in a greater capacity. So in our difficult areas they will be affected even more so.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Grade 7 Math (rising 6th graders)
 Grade 7 ELA (rising 6th graders)
 Acceleration (algebra & bio)
 Comp Sci III and Bio
 Civics

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math is a specific target as many of the teachers in this area were new or vacant as a result of the leadership changes. This had a negative impact on the proficiency of 6th grade math as a whole resulting in 14% student proficiency. Both those positions have been filled, and a Highly effective teacher in 7th grade math the previous year have been promoted to Math Interventionist to oversee and assist in improving the 7th grade student progress. About 65% of the school is made up of level 1 and 2 students in math. As this area improves, so will student achievement in all subgroups and school grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Growth from student achievement and gains on PM1, and DM assessments at the same point last year.
BWT tracking new teacher development
Monitor teacher lesson plans and common assessments

Monitoring:

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

Weekly leadership meeting, PLC, Mid year shareholders meeting, ER meetings directly following the PMs/DMs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Common planning, using the benchmark Curriculum and instruction guide, common assessments, school wide ritual and routines, math frameworks

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are the district provided resources as well as specialists to assist with monitoring implementation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Math Interventionist identified , leading Common Planning.
2. Teachers, MI, AP track student achievement.
3. Teacher development
4. Pull out/Push in - student interventions

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Ongoing with checks throughout the year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The second targeted area is Learning Gains in ELA and Math. Last year 70% of students in ELA and 65% of students in math were level 1 or 2 on the FAST assessment. 3 of 6 teaching positions in math were vacant for at least 50% of the year. 1 Vacancy in ELA for 50% of the year. With the addition of Math and ELA Interventionist, new teacher hiring, and coaching support through benchmark-aligned instruction we will see improvement in student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Growth from student achievement and gains on PM1, and DM assessments at the same point last year.
BWT tracking new teacher development
Monitor teacher lesson plans and common assessments

Monitoring:

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

Weekly leadership meeting, PLC, Mid year shareholders meeting, ER meetings directly following the PMs/DMs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Errico (erricod@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Common planning, using the benchmark Curriculum and instruction guide, common assessments, school wide ritual and routines, math frameworks

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are the district provided resources as well as specialists to assist with monitoring implementation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. ELA and Math interventionist will assist to oversee and monitor gains in each content area.
2. Teachers, MI, AP track student achievement.
3. Teacher development
4. Pull out/Push in - student interventions

Person Responsible: David Errico (erricod@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing with checks throughout the year.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Civics showed one of the largest declines last year moving from 56% in 21-22 to 41% in 22-23. We had all students enrolled in 8th grade in Civics between two cohorts. Throughout the year 4 teachers filled these two positions, two being of which were released, or left the school. The year ended with two teachers new to Civics or the profession. This year we have an experience teacher in 8th Grade Civics, a returning teacher, and an Administrative Dean who was previously a Highly Effective SS teacher to oversee.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Growth from student achievement and gains on school wide assessments and DM assessments at the same point last year.
 BWT tracking new teacher development
 Monitor teacher lesson plans and common assessments

Monitoring:

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

Weekly leadership meeting, PLC, Mid year shareholders meeting, ER meetings directly following the PMs/ DMs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ciera Johnson (johnsonc10@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Common planning, using the benchmark Curriculum and instruction guide, common assessments, school wide ritual and routines, math frameworks

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are the district provided resources as well as specialists to assist with monitoring implementation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Newly hired Academic Dean- C Johnson, with HE teaching in Civics
2. Teachers, MI, AP track student achievement.
3. Teacher development
4. Pull out/Push in - student interventions

Person Responsible: Ciera Johnson (johnsonc10@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing with checks throughout the year

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have over 10 teachers or positions that were new to Westside this school year. Over the last two years there have been a high level of teacher turn over. Attendance has begun to level out, however attendance of new teachers remain low.

Measurable Outcome:

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

- Number of teachers returning for the coming school year.
- Teacher attendance overall
- New to Westside Teacher attendance
- Using district and school surveys do teachers feel valued, supported, and want/like working at Westside

Monitoring:

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

- 5Essteinal Survey
- District and school created surveys
- Team building activities

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Errico (erricod@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- 5Essteinal Survey
- District and school created surveys
- Team building activities

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will provide anonymous feedback

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Create Team to track and plan (Errico and Admin team)
2. Track teacher attendance
3. Plan PD around teacher need and requests

Person Responsible: David Errico (erricod@duvalschools.org)

By When: End of the Year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Duval County Public Schools has a tiered system of support to align interventions for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools. The first tier of support begins with the Superintendent's cabinet of executive leaders who represent all district departments (Human Resources, Academic Services, Division of Schools, Operations, Finance, Technology, etc.). At a minimum, this team meets on a weekly basis to develop, monitor, and implement the district's strategic plan initiatives. The next level of the tier branches out with the Chief of Schools who oversees the district's Division of Schools. Schools are divided by region (Elementary, Middle, High, and Turnaround/Fragile (ISI Region)). Each region has a Regional Superintendent, Executive Directors, and Content Area Specialists who work to ensure that the support is aligned and implemented.

Ensuring adequate funding, resources, and support is available to CSI, TSI and ATSI schools is a driver for district-wide collaboration. To accomplish this, the Division of Schools works with multiple district departments to further tier support for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools.

This support includes but is not limited to the following:

- >Academic Services provides curriculum support and additional content specialists for schools. Academic Services also oversees our district professional development department and coordinates professional development for instructional and non-instructional personnel.
- >Title I – Coordinates the use of funds to best support the barriers that research has shown negatively impacts disadvantaged students. In addition, Title I provides professional development to teachers to improve their pedagogy.
- >The Division of Schools conducts school visits that include instructional reviews and instructional walks. These visits occur on a weekly basis and serve as an opportunity to observe instructional delivery, student learning, and provide feedback to school staff.
- >Finance – Finance provides the funds to provide resources and the personnel needed to address individual school needs.
- >Human Resources – Human Resources works to recruit quality personnel for our most needy schools. This includes a dedicated staffing team to our Turnaround School Region (ISI), priority hiring, and monitoring teacher VAM rating percentage by school. They also work with unions to collective bargain memorandums of understanding that provide for incentives, professional development, and additional strategies to address school needs.

Though the above examples are not comprehensive of all support provided to School Improvement schools, they do provide a snapshot of the layers of support that are available and used to improve student outcomes. Through this layered approach, the district's team along with each school's academic leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and other stakeholders collaborate on methods of improvement and monitor implementation on a continuous basis.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

This plan will be discussed and major areas of focus will be reviewed with parents and community members during the SAC and Parent Family engagement nights.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Westside middle is committed to building a strong tradition of support and community involvement. That starts with communication and familiar parent family engagement events. This year we will be having our 2nd annual events. Community PFE nights that were successful last year will be implemented once more to build community. At the events we will provide families with resources, data, and food.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We have hired many new teachers this year with experience teaching. Additionally teachers who are new are part of a teaching program who have extensive support and professional development during and throughout the year to coincide with the training required from the district. Walks will begin in fall to ensure standard aligned lessons are taking place with checks for understanding and mastery at the end of each lesson. Reading strategies are also going to be implemented across the content with the CRISS program this school year.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This school is implementing the supplemental Title I, Part A grant project. The activities in the Title I Schoolwide and Parent and Family Engagement plan were derived based on a Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process involving internal and external stakeholders. The Title I Schoolwide and Parent and Family Engagement Budgets include activities reflecting the use of funds and a rationale for each activity. Email title1@duvalschools.org for the school's Title I Schoolwide budget or Parent and Family Engagement plan and budget.