Westgate Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Westgate Elementary School

3560 58TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

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

Demographics

Principal: Bonita Paquette

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 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
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)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2020-21: (48%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Pinellas 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.

Part 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

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
Paquette, Bonita	Principal	
Sexton, Samantha	Assistant Principal	
Krauss, Kelsey	Instructional Coach	Monitor the progress of students and coach teachers to help provide the appropriate interventions when necessary. Restorative Practices Trainer.
Bleckley, Deborah	Instructional Coach	Monitor the progress of students and coach teacher to provide the appropriate interventions when necessary.
Hineline, Christie	Guidance Counselor	504 Coordinator
Ouzoun-Ash, Emine	Teacher, K-12	EL Teacher
Leinbach, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	ESE Teacher
Nylund, Natalie	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	Fifth Grade Team Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Bonita Paquette

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.*
3

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

505

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

8

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

7

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	56	78	71	83	74	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	449
Attendance below 90 percent	4	28	24	23	18	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	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 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	0	1	6	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	6	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/11/2022

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	76	95	90	111	105	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	5	18	7	12	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	2	8	15	9	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	0	7	12	8	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	1	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	76	95	90	111	105	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	5	18	7	12	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	2	8	15	9	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	0	7	12	8	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	1	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%			50%			52%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%			51%			57%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%			48%			41%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	64%			59%			55%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%			56%			54%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%			20%			37%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	48%			51%			43%	53%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

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	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
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
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	20	50		48	50		30				
ELL	29	27		43	27		36				
ASN	58			63							
BLK	25	40		33	40						
HSP	46	50		51	39		50				
MUL	67			58							
WHT	53	52	55	67	62		56				
FRL	44	46	50	56	46	23	46				
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	22	36	31	25	32	25	20				
ELL	41	67		52	56		20				
ASN	57	69		90	75		36				
BLK	33	42		22	33		19				
HSP	45	56	45	54	53	18	35				
WHT	58	62	38	60	57	41	56				
FRL	43	51	39	46	50	31	38				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	59
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	58
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?

In primary grades for ELA less than 40% of students were proficient based on end of the year MAP assessments and third grade FSA. There is a gap between black and non black students in grades K and 1 of 12 percentage points and 16 percentage points respectfully. The largest gap in third grade is between SWD and non with a gap of 21 percentage points. According to MAP 60% of rising 5th grade students are proficient in ELA. Subgroups show that no SWD were proficient and there is a gap of 31 percentage points between black and non black students and a gap of 18 percentage points between EL and non EL students. In Math, the trend across grade levels is that our black students are not performing to the level of non black students. With the largest gap occurring with our rising 5th grade students. There is a gap of 29 percentage points between black and non black students.
Our FSA scores reveal that SWD are lagging behind all students with a gap of 26 percentage points in ELA and 23 percentage points in Math. Black students show a gap of 10 percentage points in ELA and 24 percentage points in Math. Our EL students performed as well as all students with a 1% gap in ELA and 4 percentage points in math.

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

Based on 21-22 Spring MAP scores, the greatest need for improvement is ELA and Math proficiency for rising 4th grade students.
Also, closing the gap in Math between black and non black proficiency rates.

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 contributing factor to improvement needs in rising 4th grade students is behavior issues. Nine students accumulated 23 referrals and 2 threat assessments making up 33% of the total school referrals.
Careful consideration when placing students with teachers for 4th grade as well as frequent check ins with administration and school counselor.
Behavior issues made it difficult to use collaborative structures in Math and ELA. Which contributed to the gap between black and non black students.

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

The learning gains for our L25 students in math increased from 20% to 60%.

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

90 % of 3rd-5th grade teachers participated in before or after school math tutoring from January until April specifically targeting the L25 students.

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

Strategic, intentional groupings of students into classrooms.

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.

Creating a Common Language K-5 for mathematical terms. (PD) Vertical articulation, identified math and ELA champions in each grade level to model best strategies.

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

Continuation of building a culture of instructional leaders who are identified as ELA or Math experts. Teachers will open their classrooms for colleague observations and will help to lead the vertical articulation sessions.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Instructional Practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction was identified as a critical need based on MAP data, FSA, common assessments and walkthrough data collected during the 21-22 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 22-23 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 progress toward the goal. 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 and MTSS coaches to insure that action plans are being followed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific	The use of curricular materials ensures that all students have the same opportunities to interact with the standards at a high level of rigor.

strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Person Responsible   Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)

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   Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Person Responsible   Kelsey Krauss (kraussk@pcsb.org)

Continue the culture of collaboration by recruiting and retaining content specific experts at each grade-level to establish model classrooms where teachers learn from and inspire one another.

Person Responsible   Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students with disabilities scored 26 percentage points lower than all students on the ELA FSA. They also scored 26 percentage points lower than all student on the Math FSA. Black students scored 10 percentage points lower in ELA than all students and 19 percentage points lower in math.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percentage of students with disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the end of the year assessment will increase in ELA from 26% to 50% and in Math from 33% to 55%. The percentage of black students demonstrating proficiency on the end of the year assessments will increase in ELA from 42% to 70% and from 40% in math to 70%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring will occur monthly during PLC meetings. Data from classroom assessments, district assessments and ongoing progress monitoring will be evaluated and discussed. Action plans will be created for standards where students are not demonstrating growth. Action plans will be reviewed monthly and specifically looked for during weekly administrative walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelsey Krauss (kraussk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Instruction needs to be standards based and implemented with fidelity to ensure that all students have the opportunity and appropriate instructional supports.

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 and monitor the use of routine writing in all content areas; including Learning Logs, Quick Writes, Annotating the text, Creating One Pagers, Refection prompts, and/or KWLA charts.

Person Responsible	Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)

• Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/ more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible	Theresa Leinbach (leinbacht@pcsb.org)

• Utilize administrator walkthrough tools to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

Person Responsible   Samantha Sexton (sextonsa@pcsb.org)

• Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible   Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.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

57% of students in K-2 are projected to score below a level 3 on the state assessment. Identification of students who will receive support from the Project 23 intensive reading instructor occurred based on Spring 2022 data. Those students will receive intensive instruction for 30 minutes per day, 5 days a week, in a small group setting. ELFAC data will be reviewed to determine specific skill needs and regularly assessed to determine next steps for growth.

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

63% of upcoming fourth grade students scored below a level 3 on FSA ELA. Daily instruction in vocabulary development and phonics will occur in each fourth grade classroom. Skill groups will be determined from phonics surveys and daily observations in classrooms.

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)

70% of students in grades K-2 will show proficiency in ELA based on the state progress monitoring tool.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

70% of 2022-23 fourth grade students will show proficiency in ELA based on the state progress monitoring tool.

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.

Monitoring will occur monthly during ELA focused PLC meetings. Data for the month will be discussed and action steps created for students not on target to meet the goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Paquette, Bonita, paquetteb@pcsb.org

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. §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?

Monitor the whole group and small group instruction to ensure that instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence based principles.

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?

Instruction needs to be standards based and implemented with fidelity to ensure that all students have the opportunity and appropriate instructional supports.

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
PD for primary teachers with a focus on in the moment interventions based on continuous formative assessment using ELFAC and daily observations. • Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.	Bleckley, Deborah, bleckleyd@pcsb.org
• Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.	

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.

During the 21-22 school year, 76 discipline referrals were created by 33 students which is 6% of the total population. The most common discipline issue was striking a student (25 incidents) with class and campus disruption next (11 incidents). The incidents occurred most frequently in the classrooms (38 incidents) the cafeteria (13 incidents) and in the corridor or hallways (12 incidents).

Behavior Goal: Reduce the amount of discipline referrals for the 22-23 school year by 10%.
Action Steps: School counselor will conduct class lessons in each classroom that focus on social skills and alternative ways to regulate emotions.
Action Step: Review guidelines for success on the morning news, daily during the first two weeks of school and then continuing weekly.
Action Step: Grade level assemblies during the first week of school conducted by administrators and school counselor to focus on Guidelines for success and the PBIS plan.

Westgate addresses building a positive school culture and environment in the following ways: development of a school Compact and Parent and Family Engagement Plan involving stakeholders; providing curriculum information nights to families; providing equity and Restorative Practices PD to staff; providing content PD to staff; coordinating federal programs such as Promise Time; communicating with families using a school newsletter, school website, student agendas, School Messenger, and the school Facebook page; making every effort to provide information in each family's home language; conducting SAC meetings all families are invited to attend in which information regarding school function, safety, curriculum, and programs are shared; conducting the Title I Annual Parent meeting in which we discuss the Parent's Right to Know, what Title I is, the Parent and Family Engagement Plan, curriculum, and assessments; including our Parent and Family Engagement Plan on our website, at our Title I Parent Station, and by request; sending out annual surveys to staff, students, and families to gain feedback about our Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) plan; implementing a PBIS plan that includes students and staff; involving volunteers in school events

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

Stakeholders and their roles in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school include:

Administration-providing PD to staff; leading the PBIS program with PBIS team; communicating with staff, students, and families; leading the implementation of Promise Time; presenting school information at SAC meetings; presenting information at Title I Annual Parent Meeting; scheduling and monitoring curriculum nights; developing (with stakeholders) and implementing the Parent and Family Engagement Plan; ensuring websites are updated; agreeing to and following the school Compact; completing surveys regarding culture and environment of the school; inviting/including volunteers

Staff-communicating with coworkers, administration, students, and families; implementing PBIS Plan; presenting information at curriculum nights and Title I Annual Parent Meeting; participating in the Parent and Family Engagement Plan; agreeing to and following the school Compact; completing surveys regarding culture and environment of the school; inviting/including volunteers; actively participating in PD and implementing newly learned ideas

Families-volunteering if possible; participating in PTA, SAC, curriculum nights, Title I Annual Parent Meeting, conferences, etc...; communicating with administration, child(ren), and their child(ren)'s teacher(s); agreeing to and following the school Compact; completing surveys regarding culture and environment of the school

Students-agreeing to and following the school Compact; communicating with administration, teachers, peers, and their families; meeting the Guidelines for Success; completing surveys regarding culture and environment of the school.