

Pinellas County Schools

Westgate Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Westgate Elementary School

3560 58TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

<http://www.westgate-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

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 Westgate Elementary is to provide an environment in which all learners will continue to succeed through quality teaching.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Westgate Elementary is to be a community of learners where students, families and staff work together to achieve total success.

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
Oakes, Holly	Principal	School Leader, Human Resources, Curriculum support, Operations.
Henderson, Samantha	Assistant Principal	
Bleckley, Deborah	Instructional Coach	Monitor the progress of students and coach teacher to provide the appropriate interventions when necessary.
Wanek, Dana	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Wilkes, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Team Leader
Pittman, Paige	Teacher, K-12	Second Grade Team Leader
Mosher, Christopher	Teacher, K-12	Third Grade Team Leader
Kwapien, Patty	Teacher, K-12	Fourth Grade Team Leader
Smith, Robyn	Teacher, K-12	Ffith Grade Team Leader
Leinbach, Theresa	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher
Ouzoun-Ash, Emine	Teacher, K-12	ELL Teacher

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.

Three times per year the School Improvement plan is shared with school, family and community stakeholders during School Advisory Council and PTA meetings. Suggestions are requested and documented in meeting minutes. Action steps are time bound and are reviewed at subsequent meetings to monitor progress.

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))

After collecting data, sharing progress toward goals, and deciding on action steps, Key stakeholder groups follow up on a regular basis to monitor progress toward meeting SIP goals. Documentation of results can be found in meeting minutes from the PTA, SAC, and School-based Leadership Team.

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)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: B

	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	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	27	20	19	14	16	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	13	22	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	20	19	0	0	0	47
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	

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	1	0	3	10	13	0	0	0	27

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	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	28	24	23	18	26	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	4	1	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	5	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	11	16	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	12	23	0	0	0	56
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	

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	1	6	13	4	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	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	4	28	24	23	18	26	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	4	1	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	5	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	11	16	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	12	23	0	0	0	56
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	

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	1	6	13	4	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	52	54	53	52	55	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				62			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			48		
Math Achievement*	54	61	59	64	51	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				65			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			20		
Science Achievement*	69	62	54	48	62	59	51		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	81	64	59	79			84		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	310
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	29	Yes	4	1
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	62			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	59			

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%
FRL	59			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	44			
HSP	58			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	58			

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	52			54			69					81
SWD	29			36							3	
ELL	54			43			62				4	81
AMI												
ASN	67			61			80				3	
BLK	25			35							2	
HSP	57			57			61				5	75
MUL	50			50							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	53			56			71				4	
FRL	47			50			64				5	83

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	52	62	54	64	65	60	48					79
SWD	29	50		33	33							
ELL	52	65		70	70		20					79
AMI												
ASN	55	71		80	100							
BLK	21	57		46	60		36					
HSP	52	59	50	63	66	69	23					83
MUL	60			47								
PAC												
WHT	56	66	52	67	61	50	59					
FRL	46	59	57	57	60	59	45					83

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	50	51	48	59	56	20	51					84
SWD	20	50		48	50		30					
ELL	29	27		43	27		36					84
AMI												
ASN	58			63								
BLK	25	40		33	40							
HSP	46	50		51	39		50					92
MUL	67			58								
PAC												
WHT	53	52	55	67	62		56					
FRL	44	46	50	56	46	23	46					83

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
05	2023 - Spring	69%	57%	12%	54%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	58%	-13%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	53%	-1%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	62%	-11%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	66%	-11%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	60%	8%	51%	17%

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.

Math proficiency in Kindergarten was 39% overall as measured by STAR. Kindergarten students were lacking foundational skills that are typically associated with performance in Pre-K. One K classroom had a disproportionate number of unsuccessful students.

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

Math achievement in grades 3-5 decreased from 64% in 2022 to 59% in 2023. The performance of fourth grade students during 2023 was significantly lower than fourth grade performance in 2022. This group of students also showed a decline in proficiency from third grade and fourth grade.

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.

Performance in Math in Kindergarten is significantly below District and State averages. Students required intense instruction on pre-requisite skills in order to show readiness for the K math curriculum.

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

Achievement in Science improved from 48% proficiency to 68% proficiency. Students in fifth grade received high quality instruction with fidelity. Students who were not meeting specific standards in science received either tutoring or small group instruction based on that standard.

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

A small number of students are absent from school more than 10% of the time.
A small number of students are receiving the majority of behavior referrals.

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

1. Achievement in ELA in all grades will improve by 10% as measured by state and District assessments.
2. Achievement in Math in Kindergarten will improve from 39% to 60% proficiency as measured by STAR.
3. Achievement in Math in grades 3-5 will improve by 10% as measured by state and District assessments.

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 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.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction was identified as a critical need based on STAR, FAST, and District level common assessments and walkthrough data collected during the 22-23 school year. This data showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math and Science with a lack of consistency in rigorous tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to grapple with rigorous standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching strategies to support rigorous standards-aligned task development.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, 70% of students in K-5 will show proficiency in ELA, Math and Science as measured by the end of the year assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will occur during weekly PLC meetings. Once a month, student work in ELA and Math will be reviewed to determine student progress toward meeting standards. Discussions will focus on standards where 70% or more of students have shown proficiency and standards where less than 70% have shown proficiency. Action plans will be developed to implement during the next month to support standards and students where 70% proficiency has not been achieved. During the time between PLC discussions, walkthroughs will be conducted by administration, MTSS coach, and K-2 reading coach to ensure that recommended actions are followed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Oakes (oakesh@pcsb.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.)

Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of common curricular materials ensures that all students have the same opportunities to interact with the standards at a high level of rigor.

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.

Implement the instructional materials, understanding how the materials connect to evidence-based practices and B.E.S.T. Standards/FSASS

Person Responsible: Holly Oakes (oakesh@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible: Holly Oakes (oakesh@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will engage in job-embedded professional development in the context of PLC's in order to expand the knowledge and use of standards-based curriculum materials and approaches.

Person Responsible: Deborah Bleckley (bleckleyd@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

Positive school culture will be promoted and reinforced through the implementation of a robust PBIS program.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Referrals will decrease by 20% from 76 to 61 during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student behavior data will be reviewed monthly during the PBIS meeting. The PBIS walkthrough tool will be utilized by staff to measure the fidelity of PBIS implementation.

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.)

Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports will be offered to students who are not successful in following the Westgate Guidelines for Success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students students who have behavior challenges receive proactive, tier 2 and tier 3 supports, then overall behavior incidents will be reduced.

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.

Behavior data will be reviewed monthly during the School Based Leadership Meeting. Grade level trends, or actions of repeated offenders, will be noted and addressed by the team.

Person Responsible: Samantha Henderson (hendersonsam@pcsb.org)

By When: Aug 2023-May 2024

The PBIS Team will meet monthly to review the status of Tier 1-3 implementation of the school PBIS plan. The quality of Tier 1 implementation will be monitored through the use of the PBIS walkthrough monitoring tool at least twice per year. Individual student data will be reviewed to ensure that students in need, receive appropriate levels of support.

Person Responsible: Samantha Henderson (hendersonsam@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 -May 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

School and district data in Language Arts and Mathematics was significantly below that of non-black students. The current Problem-Solving process in the school was not sufficiently meeting the needs of African American students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

School and district achievement data in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics data for African American students will improve by 20% by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

During monthly data review meetings, African American subgroup data will be reviewed, and action steps will be identified to improve achievement. Formative data will be reviewed and discussed for African American students in weekly PLC meetings with teachers.

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.)

As a result of data, African American students will be screened using diagnostic data and receive appropriate interventions that meet their specific needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If African American students receive appropriate interventions with fidelity, then student achievement will improve.

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.

Utilize the MTSS process efficiently.

Person Responsible: Holly Oakes (oakesh@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Appropriate screening to identify students and diagnostic assessment to identify student specific needs.

Person Responsible: Holly Oakes (oakesh@pcsb.org)

By When: May of 2024

Determine and implement the appropriate interventions.

Person Responsible: Holly Oakes (oakesh@pcsb.org)

By When: May of 2024

#4. 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 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.

Students with disabilities scored significantly below non-ESE students on district and state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency of ESE students will improve by 20% based on end of year assessments in ELA and mathematics.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur in monthly PLCs, data from formative assessments, district assessments and classroom observations will be reviewed, and action plans will be created.

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.)

Within whole group and small group instruction evidence-based practices will be implemented to include differentiation for ESE students. Explicit instruction using a multi-sensory approach to learning will be utilized to meet individual student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If differentiated standards-based instruction is implemented with fidelity, then achievement for ESE students will improve.

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.

Diagnose students' needs design structures within core instruction to differentiated to meet the needs of students IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Deborah Bleckley (bleckleyd@pcsb.org)

By When: May of 2024

Maximize VE resources teachers schedule to ensure that all students needs are being met.

Person Responsible: Deborah Bleckley (bleckleyd@pcsb.org)

By When: May of 2024

Deliver direct, multi-sensory instruction to ESE students that is aligned with their individual IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Theresa Leinbach (leinbacht@pcsb.org)

By When: From 8/23-5/24

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).

School improvement funding is reviewed annually by our School Advisory Council (SAC). The Sac committee consists of parents, staff members and community partners. School administration provides data and rationale for expenditures, and all members discuss SIP allocations before finalizing the budget. All staff members are informed of the SIP budget at a pre-school staff meeting, and families are informed at the annual Title One meeting which is held each fall.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

In grades K-2, 59% of students scored at the proficient level during Progress Monitoring period three in the area of reading. Students scoring below the the 50th percentile received small group, targeted instruction within the classroom. Students scoring below the 30th percentile received intensive supports both inside and outside the reading block. Students in Kindergarten showed the greatest need for support on both formative and summative assessments.

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

In grades 3-5, 57% of students scored at level three or above in the F.A.S.T. assessment during Progress Monitoring period three. Students scoring below the the 50th percentile received small group, targeted instruction within the classroom. Students scoring below the 30th percentile received intensive supports both inside and outside the reading block. Students in 4th grade showed the greatest need for supports based on both formative and summative assessments.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

In grades K-2, 70% of students will score at the proficient level as measured by the Star assesement that will be admintered in progress monitoring period three during thej 2023-2024 school year. In 2022-2023, 59% of students scored at the proficient level in reading in grades K-2.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In grades 3-5, 70% of students will score at level 3 or above on the F.A.S.T. Reading assessment during progress monitoring period 3 during the 2023-2024 school year. In 2022-2023, 59% of students in grades K-2 scored level 3 or above in grades 3-5.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Both adminstration and school-based MTSS and Literacy Coaches will montior student data as well as best practices in the classrooms to ensure that students are consistently receiving the scaffolded supports necessary to ensure student success.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Oakes, Holly, oakesh@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

Student progress in the area of reading is monitored using monthly I-sip results, ELFAC results, running records, and Module Assessment results. Progress monitoring data is reviewed weekly during PLC's and monthly in data review meetings that are conducted by administration. All programs used align with the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Evidence-based practice programs are selected based on recommendations from our District office. All programs utilized are vetted to ensure they are research-based.

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
Targeted, differentiated supports will be provided to students not meeting proficiency in reading based on progress monitoring data.	Oakes, Holly, oakesh@pcsb.org
Literacy Coaches will provide targeted coaching in Tier 1 practices for teachers who demonstrate a need based on progress monitoring data.	Bleckley, Deborah, bleckleyd@pcsb.org

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.

The School Improvement plan is posted on both the school and District websites. A SIP review takes place for teachers at least 3 times per year. The SIP is also reviewed by the School Advisory Council, and PTA twice per year with the opportunity for stakeholder feedback.

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))

Each year our families sign a compact to agree to support their child in school. We offer multiple family information and curriculum nights throughout the year. Each year the principal offers a welcome meeting as well as a mid-year update which are delivered via PTA meetings. The School Improvement Plan is available on the school website throughout the year.

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)

A professional development schedule is created at the beginning of the school year. Training is selected based on data that has determined need. Professional development is monitored, and teachers are provided with feedback by administration and peers. Data is regularly shared with teachers to determine the success of implemented curriculum. Interventions and modifications are made to ensure that all students receive the essential curriculum.

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))

The SIP plan is developed in compliance with State and Federal requirements for student safety, ESSA 1114(b)(5) and Early Childhood Education.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Westgate Elementary School employs a full-time school counselor who provides weekly social skills lessons as well as small group lessons based on student need. The school also has access to a school psychologist and social worker. Each week the Student Services Team meets to discuss schoolwide and individual student needs.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

The school counselor provides career awareness through a District provided electronic platform. Students in grades 4 and 5 interact with the platform to assist in determining strengths and interests. The school also partners with the community for the Great American Teach-in each year. The school also partners with area businesses who have a presence at various schoolwide events.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Westgate Elementary School employs a robust MTSS problem solving framework in grades Pre-K-5. The MTSS team ensures that Tier 1 provisions for positive behavior take place through our PBIS program. The team also provides individual supports and behavior plans for students that demonstrate this need in order to be successful in the classroom.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional development is provided to staff throughout the school year. Monthly staff meetings are utilized to provide teachers and support staff with information and curriculum supports. School administration monitors for evidence of implementation after training. Grade level PLC's also provide a vehicle for job-embedded professional development. School administration as well as the MTSS coach regularly attend PLC's to move professional development into application in the classroom.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Pre-K students are provided with a comprehensive instructional and social emotional program that is designed to prepare them for Kindergarten. All pre-K students are monitored throughout the year on key performance factors. The Pre-K program is also evaluated annually by District and State evaluators.