Westgate Elementary School

2019-20 School 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

2018-19 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: C
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
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.](http://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 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
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Paquette, Bonita	Principal
Principal	
Krauss, Kelsey	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Teasdale, Deanna	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Dinaro, Jonathan	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Mattos, JoAnn	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Bennett, Sharon	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Wilkes, Tammy	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Gray, James	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Kwapien, Patty	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
McClintick, Tara	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
McNaughton, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Breeding, Charmion	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	92	100	104	95	91	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	11	19	17	9	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	17	23	5	5	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	37	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
40

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 6/13/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	16	23	26	15	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	29	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	7	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	54%	57%	46%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	59%	58%	41%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	54%	53%	49%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	55%	61%	63%	58%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	54%	61%	62%	45%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	48%	51%	25%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	43%	53%	53%	49%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	92 (0)	100 (0)	104 (0)	95 (0)	91 (0)	100 (0)	582 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 ()	19 ()	17 ()	9 ()	12 ()	8 ()	76 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	17 (0)	23 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	23 (0)	73 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (0)	37 (0)	31 (0)	86 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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

NOTE: 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**
03	2019	55%	56%	-1%	58%	-3%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	56%	-8%	58%	-10%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
	2018	58%	62%	-4%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%
	2018	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	52%	60%	-8%	60%	-8%
	2018	52%	61%	-9%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
	2018	47%	57%	-10%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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				

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	25	45		32	45						
ELL	30	53		50	45						
ASN	57	39		78	72						
BLK	30	45	58	35	24	15	29				
HSP	49	50		58	41		44				
MUL	57	27		57	27						
WHT	48	38	55	62	52	38	54				
FRL	39	41	49	53	43	26	45				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	65
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	53
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

SWD had the lowest proficiency performance in ELA with 22% proficient (a drop of 3% from the previous year). Black students had the lowest proficiency performance in math with 22% of students reaching proficiency (a decline of 13% from the previous year). One contributing factor is that not all classroom teachers are using CRT strategies. When students don't feel connected to the classroom or curriculum, they don't perform as well as students who do. Another contributing factor was that one of the VE teachers was new to Westgate and new to VE resource. It took her some time to get to know the students, the curriculum and the processes.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from last year was our SWD learning gains and black student proficiency in math. 32% SWD made learning gains (a 13% decline) and 22% of black students were proficient (a 13% decline).One contributing factor is that not all classroom teachers are using CRT strategies. When students don't feel connected to the classroom or curriculum, they don't perform as well as students who do. Another contributing factor was that one of the VE teachers was new to Westgate and new to VE resource. It took her some time to get to know the students, the curriculum and the processes.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was our science proficiency at 43% with the state average of 53%.Contributing factors to the decline in Science scores include the fact that intermediate teachers had a difficult time following the timeline of the science modules. They were often behind and tried to play catch up. This has a rippling effect. Students enter fifth grade without deepened exposure to all of the standards that they should have been taught. This is evident from the Benchmark assessment that students take in fifth grade and the number of standards that need remediation. Another contributing factor is the lack of instruction surrounding the Nature of Science. Students need exposure more than once a year during District Science Fair.

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

ELA data showed the most improvement with 52% of students reaching proficiency, 57% making learning gains. All teachers were aware of the previous year's achievement data and knew which "bucket" their students fit in. We grouped students for extending learning according to levels of achievement and focused on strategies to help them move forward. ISIP reports were used to assign differentiated Istation assignments for all students. Teachers would supplement computer programs with small group instruction in the same areas of difficulty.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

An area of concern from the EWS data is that 86 students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade scored a Level 1 on a state assessment.
Another area of concern is the decrease in achievement scores in ELA and Math between co-hort 3rd and 4th grade students. Three year trend data shows a decrease every year from third to fourth in ELA: 15-16 50% to 46%, 16-17 64% to 49%, 17-18 52% to 48%. Math trends show a decrease in two out of three years: 15-16, 54% to 59%, 16-17, 66% to 60% and 17-18, 58% to 49%.

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

1. Overall Math, ELA and Science Proficiency
2. Black student proficiency and learning gains in ELA and Math
3. SWD proficiency and learning gains in ELA and Math
4. L25 learning gains in ELA and Math
5. Closing the gap between 3rd and 4th grade co-hort students in ELA and Math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase the level of proficiency for all students in science
Rationale	Science proficiency during the 2018-2019 school year was 44% which was a 5% decrease for the school from the previous year and is 11% less than the district average.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By July 2020, the overall proficiency in science will increase from 44% to 55% as measured by SSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charmion Breeding (breedingc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered learning with rigor for all grade levels. Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignments to the 1st-5th grade standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers struggle to implement effective instruction in a timely manner and often fall significantly behind the pacing guide. Because of this, content is either taught will minimal rigor or is not taught at all during that year.

Action Step	
Description	1. Integrate science content within ELA units 2. Monitor pacing through observations and lesson plans 3. Ensure the science block is uninterrupted 4. Team planning twice per week 5. School wide yearlong focus on NSE 6. Unit assessment data will be utilized to determine low performing standards to add to review plan
Person Responsible	Charmion Breeding (breedingc@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Increase the level of performance for all students in ELA
Rationale	While the ELA proficiency increased from 46% to 52%, we are still lower than the district and the state. Also, subgroups of students are not performing near that proficiency rate. Only 33% of black students were proficient and 22% of students with disabilities showed proficiency on FSA.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, all students showing proficiency on the Florida state assessment will increase from 52% to 60%. Additionally, proficiency levels of all subgroups will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Deliver instruction in both reading and writing designed according to research-based principles. For example, the teaching follows the "gradual release of responsibility" model of teaching. Within this model, there are five main methods of teaching: demonstration, guided practice, explicitly telling and showing an example, inquiry and repertoire lessons. During instruction, the goal should be for all students- not some, not most, but all-to be attentive, listening and responding to instruction and engaged in literate behaviors (reading, writing, speaking, & listening).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting the above strategy is to ensure that instruction is delivered in a manner that is beneficial for all students. According to FSA data, subgroups of students are falling behind. Black students, students with disabilities and English language learners proficiency rates are far below other subgroups.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide PD to teachers who are unfamiliar with research-based strategies 2. Empower ELA champions/cohort teachers and high performing ELA teachers to develop as literacy leaders to co-facilitate pd sessions alongside administrators and to open classrooms for observation and feedback as well as coaching colleagues in literacy practices. 3. Use AVID team members to provide PD to whole school regarding organizational strategies. In addition,intermediate teachers will receive PD in teaching two and three column notes to their students. 4. Monitoring the fidelity of small group instruction in all classrooms and providing feedback 5. Continued PD in CRT strategies and monitoring the use of strategies in classrooms 6. Teachers will plan collaboratively each week for ELA instruction 7. PLCs will be used as a time for teachers to "do the work" themselves
Person Responsible	Kelsey Krauss (kraussk@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Increase the level of performance for all students in Math
Rationale	Math proficiency scores decreased by 3 percentage points from 2018 to 2019. Currently 55% of students showed proficiency as measured by the Florida State Assessment. This is below the district and state averages by 7 percentage points.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, the level of math proficiency for all students will increase from 55% to 64%. In addition, the proficiency scores for subgroups of students will increase by a minimum of 8 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLC's and feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When rigorous, student centered instruction occurs, the level of active engagement increases also. The more actively engaged students are, the more likely they are to comprehend the standard at the level necessary to perform successfully. FSA data was used to determine the strategy that would be used.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide PD to teachers regarding Ready Classroom, Dreambox and Number Routines 2. Empower mathematics teacher leaders(math co-hort participants) to create and sustain a culture of feedback and openness, including ongoing teacher to teacher feedback, learning walks, mentor support. 3. Utilize multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction, including Unit Assessment, Exit Tickets, MFAs and/or "in the moment" student work analysis. 4. Continued PD in CRT strategies and monitoring of usage. 5. Use of Digital Comprehension Checks to inform instruction
Person Responsible	Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Increase the percentage of L25 students making learning gains in ELA and Math
Rationale	During the 2018-2019 school year 41% of L25 students made learning gains in ELA (an 8% decline) and 37% of L25 students made learning gains in math (a 12% increase). While learning gains of L25 students improved from the previous year, less than half of L25 students are making appropriate learning gains in both ELA and math.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By July 2020, 55% of L25 students will make learning gains in ELA and 50% will make learning gains in math according to the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelsey Krauss (kraussk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Regularly assess (formally and informally) and analyze data in PLCs to inform instruction in whole group, small group, as well as one-to-one instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	L25 students need to make more than a year's worth of growth in each subject area in order to meet their learning gain goal. Because of this, they need to be closely monitored throughout the year and provided differentiated instruction to identify and close gaps while also ensure mastery in grade level content.

Action Step	
Description	1. Use formative and summative assessment data to determine mastery of standards 2. Offer additional learning opportunities specific for L25 students including extended learning. 3. Monitor fidelity of small group instruction 4. Identify L25 students and identify appropriate interventions prior to the beginning of the school year 5. Implement AVID strategies
Person Responsible	Kelsey Krauss (kraussk@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Bridging the Gap
Rationale	The FSA data shows that a gap in levels of proficiency exists between black students and non black students in both ELA and Math. 33% of black students performed at proficiency level or above on FSA ELA as compared to 52% of white students, 44% of Asian students and 36% of Hispanic students. Math FSA scores show that 22% of black students were proficient compared to 58% of white students, 81% of Asian students and 43% of Hispanic students. One reason this gap is occurring is the lack of culturally relevant teaching in all classrooms.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By July 2020, black students will increase in proficiency by at least 15% in both ELA and math according to the FSA and their ESSA reference index will increase from 30% to 41% or higher. Expectation for 100% Learning gains for the subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using our site-based AVID team, we will ensure monthly professional develop in Culturally Relevant Teaching/AVID strategies will occur.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The components of CRT (communicating high expectations, teacher as facilitator, student center instruction, enabling students to see themselves in the curriculum) are all ways to ensure students from diverse backgrounds receive instruction that is engaging and rigorous which will in turn lead them towards proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	1. Monitor and provide targeted actionable feedback around the use of CRT strategies through lesson plans and walkthroughs 2. Monthly CRT/AVID professional development during PLCs 3. Purchase Culturally Relevant Literature for classroom use 4. Cultivate at least one model CRT classroom 5. Review monthly CRT classroom audit and self-reflection findings
Person Responsible	Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Students who are taught healthy habits throughout their academic years, tend to be healthier adults.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Westgate Elementary will follow the guidelines for Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework, in order to maintain Silver recognition.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dana Wanek (wanekd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Wellness activities throughout the school will be commuicated through weekly newsletters
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Since becoming a recognized Healthy School, choices regarding snacks for staff and students have changed. The staff and students are more aware of healthy alternatives.

Action Step	
Description	1. Maintain a Healthy School's team consisting of Wellness Champion, Cafeteria Manager, PE Teacher, Classroom teachers and administrator 2.Complete the Healthy Schools Program Assessment 3.Complete SMART Snack School Documentation 4. Implement Healthy Schools Plan 5. Submit Application
Person Responsible	Dana Wanek (wanekd@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Closing the Achievement Gap between students with disabilities and non disabled students.
Rationale	Our current level of performance of SWD is 22% proficient in ELA and 25% proficient in Math as measured by the 2019 FSA data. One reason why this gap is occurring is the lack of collaborative planning between ESE and General Education teachers. If both Gen-ed and VE resource teachers consistently utilized data to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase the achievement of SWD, the problem/gap would be reduced.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We expect our performance level to increase to 41% proficient or higher in both ELA and Math by the end of the 2019-20 school year. The ESSA reference index for SWD will increase from 27% to 56%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charmion Breeding (breedingc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure that Gen-Ed and VE resource teachers intentionally plan for the differentiated needs of EACH student with consideration of the principles of UDL to ensure content is accessible to the broadest range of learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on the learning gains and trend data for other student in the school where collaborative planning is occurring, it is evident that those strategies contribute to increased performance.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide embedded PD and coaching supports centered around utilizing data to drive instruction. 2. Ensure that ESE teachers receive ongoing PD aligned to implementing standards-based instruction. 3. Schedule collaborative planning sessions with VE resource teachers and Gen-Ed teachers after school and compensate with Title I funds 4. Ensure instructional supports are in place during core instruction and independent practice. 5.
Person Responsible	Charmion Breeding (breedingc@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Conditions for Learning
Rationale	When students receive office referrals they miss instructional time which may cause the development of an instructional gap.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, the number of student receiving office referrals will decrease from 32 to 20 with the total number of office referrals decreasing from 88 to 65.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charmion Breeding (breedingc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Staff members' knowledge and implementation of Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies and Restorative Practices will be strengthened through professional development and effective planning and collaboration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When CRT strategies and RP are implemented effectively, students behaviors will decrease which will result in increased instructional time for all students.

Action Step	
Description	1. Equity training that includes CRT strategies 2. RP trainer will collaborate with instructional staff on an as needed basis 3. Monitor office referrals and share data with SBLT for input and problem solving 4. Monthly AVID CRT training during PLCs 5.
Person Responsible	Charmion Breeding (breedingc@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Performance of EL students
Rationale	The ESSA shows that 41% of EL students were proficient on 2019 FSA in ELA.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June of 2020, the percentage of EL students proficient on FSA will increase from 41% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Emine Ouzoun-Ash (ouzoun-ashe@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom teachers will collaborate with the ESOL teacher to plan and deliver instruction to their EL students aligned with their language proficiency levels. The EL instruction and activities will be based on grade level standards and will include language objectives that will support their English language development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If teachers provide EL students with rigorous lessons that are aligned to on-grade level standards and instruction and are aligned to their English language abilities, the gap will be reduced by at least 6%.
Action Step	
Description	1. Utilize Ellevation to obtain students' length of time in US schools and language proficiency levels; provide this data to teachers so they can plan effective instruction 2. Provide learning opportunities for teachers on the use of WIDA Ellevation reports and Can Do Approach to support differentiated planning and instruction, based on student language proficiency levels 3. Utilize the implementation of Can Do Descriptors and Model Performance Indicators in the planning and practice within all classrooms to ensure instruction matches the needs of ELs and scaffolding provides and appropriate entry-point for grade-level content with ongoing support. 4. Administrators will monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons to engage ELs in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development. They will utilize the Marzano Focus Model Go To Strategies for English Language Learners document to provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support development of their practice in supporting ELs. 5. Develop a plan to monitor the LF student performance 6. Create a schedule for the Bilingual Assistant that directly supports standards-based instruction for ELs; provide appropriate PD first. 7. Have a school plan for meaningful communication with families via the website, newsletter, parent letters, phone calls, etc. and ensure communication is available in languages spoken by ELs; utilize LionBridge interpretation phone services

Person Responsible	Emine Ouzoun-Ash (ouzoun-ashe@pcsb.org)

#10	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Attendance during the 2018-2019 school year was 94.5% with 34 students missing more than 10% of school. When students miss academic instruction, gaps are developed. The more time a student misses school the higher risk they have of not meeting grade level expectations.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, attendance for all students will increase from 94.5% to 96%. The number of student missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 34 students to 25 students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charmion Breeding (breedingc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen and monitor the implementation of Tier interventions to address and support the needs of all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When a classroom has 100% attendance they will display a sign on their classroom door announcing that all students are present so other school members can acknowledge them. When a class has 95% or greater attendance in a month they will be recognized at a Character Assembly. Families will be contacted after 3 absences and every absence thereafter.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review attendance processes with all staff members 2. Acknowledge classes with 100% attendance each day by displaying a sign on classroom door 3. Recognize classes with 95% or greater attendance each month at Character Assemblies 4. Ensure attendance is accurately taken daily 5. Frequently communicate with families about the importance of consistent attendance
Person Responsible	Charmion Breeding (breedingc@pcsb.org)

#11	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	When families are informed and engaged with what is happening at school, the school and home become partners and students tend to be more successful.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Attendance at the three academic family nights will be greater than 50% each, for each grade level K-5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bonita Paquette (paquetteb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Attendance sheets for family events last year show that on average, 35% of the school's population attended. By providing parents with hands on resources in an engaging manner to help their students with ELA, Math and Science, attendance will increase from 35% to 50%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When families are engaged and informed about the curriculum and how to help their students, students are more successful in the classroom.
Action Step	
Description	1. Effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices 2. Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home. 3. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students 4. Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

NA

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase the level of proficiency for all students in science				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

			4771 - Westgate Elementary School			$500.00
			Notes: Purchase non-fiction, science standard related literature at student instructional levels in order to integrate science and ELA effectively.			
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Increase the level of performance for all students in ELA**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100		4771 - Westgate Elementary School			$0.00
			Notes: The use of Title I paraprofessionals to support classrooms with struggling students. Paraprofessionals will pull small groups using Jan Richardson reading strategies and implement the new RISE intervention program. In addition, an intervention teacher (certified teacher) will work with struggling students one on one and in small groups to help to close the achievement gap.			
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Increase the level of performance for all students in Math**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100		4771 - Westgate Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$0.00
			Notes: The use of Title I paraprofessionals to support classrooms with struggling students. Paraprofessionals will pull small groups to support Math standards. In addition, an intervention teacher (certified teacher) will work with struggling students one on one and in small groups to help to close the achievement gap.			
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Increase the percentage of L25 students making learning gains in ELA and Math**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100		4771 - Westgate Elementary School			$0.00
			Notes: Purchase RISE intervention kit and CR Literature books for use in the classrooms.			
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100		4771 - Westgate Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,000.00
			Notes: Purchase additional Culturally Relevant Literature for classroom libraries and well as for use in instruction.			
6	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Closing the Achievement Gap between students with disabilities and non disabled students.**				**$0.00**
8	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning**				**$0.00**
9	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Performance of EL students**				**$0.00**
10	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Attendance**				**$0.00**

11	III.A	Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	$1,500.00