**Orange County Public Schools** 

# Westridge Middle



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

### **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information             | 4  |
| Needs Assessment               | 6  |
| Planning for Improvement       | 10 |
| Title I Requirements           | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 17 |

### **Westridge Middle**

3800 W OAK RIDGE RD, Orlando, FL 32809

https://westridgems.ocps.net/

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|------------------------|---|
| Middle School<br>6-8                          | Yes                    | 100%  |

| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2) |
|---|----------------|---|
| K-12 General Education                  | No             | 98%   |

#### **School Grades History**

| Year  | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | D       | С       | С       | D*      |

#### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

#### **SIP Authority**

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name              | Title               |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Turner, Matthew   | Principal           |
| Fontaine, Derrick | Assistant Principal |
| Flynn, Timothy    | Assistant Principal |
| Monheim, Jessica  | Instructional Coach |
| West, Kanishia    | Instructional Coach |
| Haan, Destiny     | Instructional Coach |
| Harper, Sarah     | Instructional Coach |

#### **Duties**

## Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

All instructional leadership team members will serve an active role in shared decision making as it relates to their individual monitoring responsibilities. All instructional leadership team members will actively report to the school principal.

Mr. Turner will monitor the roles and responsibilities of all staff members in order to ensure appropriate implementation of and adherence to the school improvement plan areas of focus. As a result of an analysis of school grade data components, Mr. Turner will directly progress monitor student learning in mathematics.

Mr. Fontaine will monitor student engagement and student discipline through an active adoption of behavioral systems within the multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) framework. Mr. Fontaine will progress monitor student learning and teacher effectiveness in science and reading.

Mr. Flynn will monitor student learning trends in all content areas through an active adoption of academic systems within the multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) framework. Mr. Flynn will progress monitor student learning and teacher effectiveness in english-language arts and social studies.

Ms. Haan will support all teachers with an intense focus on pedagogical practice, lesson-planning, data-analysis, differentiation of instruction, collaborative learning structures and student engagement

strategies. Ms. Haan will be responsible for student achievement in social studies.

Ms. Harper will support all teachers with an intense focus on pedagogical practice. Ms. Harper will specifically focus support with lesson planning, data analysis, differentiation of instruction, collaborative learning structures, and student engagement strategies with first and second year teachers. Ms. Harper will be responsible for student achievement and learning gains in english language arts.

Ms. West will support mathematics teachers with an intense focus on pedagogical practice, lesson planning, data analysis, differentiation of instruction, collaborative learning structures, and student engagement strategies. Ms. West will be responsible for student achievement and learning gains in mathematics.

Ms. Monheim will support science teachers with an intense focus on pedagogical practice, lesson planning, data analysis, differentiation of instruction, collaborative learning structures, and student engagement strategies. Ms. Monheim will be responsible for student achievement in science.

#### **Early Warning Systems**

#### Year 2017-18

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator                       | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86  | 80  | 95  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 261   |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 87  | 107 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 321   |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 215 | 228 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 644   |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 271 | 262 | 242 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 775   |  |

## The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grad | de Lev | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|--------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                  | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7      | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210  | 204    | 224 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 638   |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   |   |   |   |   | G | rad | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                           | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3   | 13   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |

#### Date this data was collected

Monday 7/2/2018

#### Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| mulcator                        | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90  | 83  | 108 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 281   |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82  | 86  | 64  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 232   |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 | 148 | 145 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 462   |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 220 | 214 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 671   |  |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |  |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |  |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grad | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106  | 88   | 104 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 298   |

#### **Year 2016-17 - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator                       | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90  | 83  | 108 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 281   |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82  | 86  | 64  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 232   |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 | 148 | 145 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 462   |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 220 | 214 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 671   |  |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |  |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |  |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grad | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                                  | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106  | 88   | 104 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 298   |

### Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

#### **Assessment & Analysis**

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

#### Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data component that performed the lowest was achievement in Mathematics. Mathematics achievement had increased the previous two school years, but saw a 5% drop in 2017-2018.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The percentage of students who made learning gains in mathematics showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Thirty-six percent of students made a learning gain in mathematics in the 2017-2018 school year, a 10% drop from the prior year.

#### Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was achievement in Mathematics. A 28% discrepancy exists in this data component.

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Student achievement on the Statewide Science Assessment increased from 27% to 33% in the 2017-2018 school year. Science achievement has fluctuated from 2014 to 2018.

#### Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Achievement increases in science were due in large part to specific supports provided to identified students based on a series of progress monitoring activities over the course of the school year. Additionally, the school received direct support from district personnel in the facilitation of professional learning communities, professional teacher learning, and specific learning targets identified on a modified instructional focus calendar.

#### **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).

| Sohool Grade Component      |        | 2018     |       | 2017   |          |       |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 31%    | 52%      | 53%   | 36%    | 52%      | 52%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 37%    | 50%      | 54%   | 55%    | 53%      | 53%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 34%    | 42%      | 47%   | 51%    | 44%      | 45%   |  |
| Math Achievement            | 30%    | 53%      | 58%   | 32%    | 53%      | 55%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 36%    | 51%      | 57%   | 46%    | 53%      | 55%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 34%    | 44%      | 51%   | 44%    | 46%      | 47%   |  |
| Science Achievement         | 33%    | 51%      | 52%   | 28%    | 48%      | 50%   |  |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 56%    | 68%      | 72%   | 50%    | 67%      | 67%   |  |

### **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Le  | Grade Level (prior year reported) |           |           |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Indicator                       | 6         | 7                                 | 8         | Total     |  |  |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 86 (90)   | 80 (83)                           | 95 (108)  | 261 (281) |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 127 (82)  | 87 (86)                           | 107 (64)  | 321 (232) |  |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 201 (169) | 215 (148)                         | 228 (145) | 644 (462) |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 271 (237) | 262 (220)                         | 242 (214) | 775 (671) |  |  |  |

#### **Grade Level Data**

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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06           | 2018                  | 25%    | 48%      | -23%                              | 52%   | -27%                           |
|              | 2017                  | 26%    | 52%      | -26%                              | 52%   | -26%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison             | -1%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison               |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07           | 2018                  | 27%    | 48%      | -21%                              | 51%   | -24%                           |
|              | 2017                  | 33%    | 52%      | -19%                              | 52%   | -19%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison             | -6%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison               | 1%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08           | 2018                  | 28%    | 55%      | -27%                              | 58%   | -30%                           |
|              | 2017                  | 28%    | 52%      | -24%                              | 55%   | -27%                           |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | -5%                   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|              |                       |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade        | Year                  | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06           | 2018                  | 15%    | 35%      | -20%                              | 52%   | -37%                           |
|              | 2017                  | 26%    | 43%      | -17%                              | 51%   | -25%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison             | -11%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison               |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07           | 2018                  | 28%    | 51%      | -23%                              | 54%   | -26%                           |
|              | 2017                  | 29%    | 52%      | -23%                              | 53%   | -24%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison             | -1%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison               | 2%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08           | 2018                  | 5%     | 32%      | -27%                              | 45%   | -40%                           |
|              | 2017                  | 13%    | 30%      | -17%                              | 46%   | -33%                           |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | -24%                  |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 08         | 2018     | 28%    | 49%      | -21%                              | 50%   | -22%                           |
|            | 2017     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2018 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2017 |        |          |                             |       |                          |

|      |        | vvcsinage | wiidaic                     |       |                          |
|------|--------|-----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
|      |        | CIVIC     | S EOC                       |       |                          |
| Year | School | District  | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2018 | 49%    | 66%       | -17%                        | 71%   | -22%                     |
| 2017 | 49%    | 67%       | -18%                        | 69%   | -20%                     |
| Co   | ompare | 0%        |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | HISTOI    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District  | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2018 |        |           |                             |       |                          |
| 2017 |        |           |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | ALGEB     | RA EOC                      | •     |                          |
| Year | School | District  | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2018 | 59%    | 61%       | -2%                         | 62%   | -3%                      |
| 2017 | 72%    | 53%       | 19%                         | 60%   | 12%                      |
| Co   | ompare | -13%      |                             | 1     |                          |
|      | •      | GEOME     | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District  | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2018 | 83%    | 65%       | 18%                         | 56%   | 27%                      |
| 2017 | 74%    | 43%       | 31%                         | 53%   | 21%                      |
| Co   | ompare | 9%        |                             |       |                          |

### Subgroup Data

|           | 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|-----------|---|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                               | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 5   | 15        | 18                | 12           | 27         | 24                 | 3           | 22         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 13  | 31        | 32                | 16           | 26         | 29                 | 15          | 39         | 57           |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 67  | 43        |                   | 62           | 57         |                    |             |            | 82           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 29  | 38        | 36                | 28           | 34         | 37                 | 28          | 59         | 57           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 30  | 35        | 31                | 29           | 35         | 31                 | 36          | 53         | 66           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 35  | 31        |                   | 47           | 53         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 30  | 37        | 35                | 29           | 34         | 34                 | 34          | 57         | 61           |                         |                           |
|           |   | 2017      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                               | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| SWD       | 6   | 25        | 23                | 4            | 32         | 32                 | 10          | 19         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 13  | 27        | 27                | 21           | 39         | 39                 | 7           | 36         | 61           |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 88  | 74        |                   | 88           | 74         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 32  | 39        | 34                | 32           | 47         | 40                 | 24          | 54         | 64           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 29  | 39        | 31                | 34           | 43         | 40                 | 24          | 55         | 72           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 37  | 28        |                   | 44           | 44         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |

| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| FRL                                       | 33          | 40        | 32                | 35           | 46         | 40                 | 27          | 55         | 70           |                         |                           |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

| Activity #1         |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Title               | Staff will improve standards-based instruction through use of close reading and text dependent questions in all content areas in order to increase student learning gains and proficiency.   |
| Rationale           | School-grade trends revealed a need for a school-wide focus on all content areas in order to improve learning for all subgroups of students.   |
|                     | Westridge Middle School will improve to a letter grade of "C" in the 2018-19 school year by attaining the following content-specific outcomes:   |
|                     | Mathematics: Student achievement will increase from 30% proficient to 35%.   |
|                     | Student learning gains will increase from 36% of students earning a learning gain to 46%.  |
|                     | Student learning gains in the lowest 25% will increase from 34% of students earning a learning gain to 44%.  |
| Intended<br>Outcome | English Language Arts: Student achievement will increase from 31% proficient to 36%.   |
|                     | Student learning gains in will increase from 37% of students earning a learning gain to 47%.   |
|                     | Student learning gains in the lowest 25% will increase from 34% of students earning a learning gain to 44%.  |
|                     | Student achievement in science will increase from 33% proficient to 38%.   |
|                     | Student achievement in social studies will increase from 56% proficient to 61%.  |
|                     | The percent of students earning an acceleration point will increase from 62% to 70%.   |
| Point<br>Person     | Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@ocps.net)   |
| Action Step         |  |
|                     | Administrative team will develop and retain a highly qualified instructional coaching team in order to directly support teacher development and student learning in all content areas.   |
|                     | Assistant Principal and instructional coaches will intentionally cohort and schedule students based on prior year assessment data.   |
| Description         | Assistant Principal and instructional coaches will target groups of students based on performance on prior year assessments as well as progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data throughout the year to intentionally provide students additional instruction in the form of a dedicated course in the students schedule and saturday school. |
|                     | School-based leadership team will regularly provide focused generative non-evaluative feedback to teachers in order to support student learning in all content areas.  |
|                     | School-based leadership team will regularly monitor instructional trends and actively provide support and professional learning in order to address observed needs.  |

DPLC Team will support staff with the implementation of close reading and text-dependent questioning strategies learned at district trainings.

Assistant principal will build the school's master schedule in order to strategically support student learning.

Principal will recruit math tutors to remediation and enrichment to targeted groups of students.

Principal will provide monetary bonuses for teacher retention.

The Principal will allocate funds for the purchase of music instruments for band and orchestra. These instruments are tied to core instructional gains as they engage the whole child, provide incentives for attending school and excelling in core curricular classes such as math, science and ELA. Students that engage in music classes show improved math and reading proficiency as well as an increase in attendance and total school engagement.

#### Person Responsible

Timothy Flynn (timothy.flynn@ocps.net)

#### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

#### **Description**

Administrators will monitor classroom instruction and student performance data to determine whether specific action steps are effective in yielding the intended outcomes.

#### Person Responsible

Timothy Flynn (timothy.flynn@ocps.net)

|                     | westriage Middle   |
|---------------------|--|
| Activity #2         |  |
| Title               | Teachers will implement collaborative learning structures and student response rate management strategies in order to engage students in learning and decrease instances of negative student behavior. |
| Rationale           | School climate survey results and classroom walkthrough trend data reveal a need for a focus on student engagement in order to improve the educative experience for all subgroups of students.         |
|                     | Students will be authentically engaged in standards-based classroom learning tasks during all instructional time.  |
|                     | Student performance data will increase in all content areas as a result of increased student engagement with the standards.  |
| Intended<br>Outcome | The number of Level 1 offenses will decrease by 100% from 65 referrals to 0 referrals as a result of increased student engagement.   |
|                     | The number of Level 2 offenses will decrease by 33% from 523 referrals to 350 referrals as a result of increased student engagement.   |
|                     | The number of Level 3 offenses will decrease by 68% from 482 referrals to 150 referrals as a result of increased student engagement.   |
| Point<br>Person     | Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@ocps.net)   |
| Action Step         |  |
|                     | School-based leadership team will provide training and support to teachers on strategies to authentically engage students in learning tasks.   |
|                     | Teachers will actively implement collaborative learning structures and response rate management strategies in order to motivate students to engage in the thinking of the standard taught.             |
|                     | School and district-based leadership teams will train teachers in culturally responsive teaching strategies in order to support the learning of all students.  |
|                     | Teachers will actively increase student engagement in standards-based learning by building and maintaining student relationships and positive learning environments.                                   |
| Description         | School-based leadership team will provide focussed generative non-evaluative feedback to teachers in order to support teacher adoption and appropriate use of authentic engagement strategies.         |
|                     | School based leadership will provide incentives for students exhibiting positive behavior in the classroom throughout the school day resulting in a decrease in referrals and classroom disruptions.   |
|                     | School based leadership will monitor school referrals bi-weekly through the Enterprise Data Warehouse, as well as have a mandatory monthly meeting to discuss all discipline items.                    |

The Principal will allocate funds for the purchase of music instruments for band and

orchestra. These instruments are tied to core instructional gains as they engage the whole

child, provide incentives for attending school and excelling in core curricular classes such as math, science and ELA. Students that engage in music classes show improved math and reading proficiency as well as an increase in attendance and total school engagement.

Teachers will adopt digital tools to authentically engage students in all standards-based learning tasks.

Person Responsible

Derrick Fontaine (derrick.fontaine@ocps.net)

#### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

Administrators will actively monitor classroom instruction and trends in student engagement to evaluate the effectiveness of specific action steps in yielding intended outcomes.

Person Responsible

Derrick Fontaine (derrick.fontaine@ocps.net)

| Activity #3           |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Title                 | Staff understanding of cultural awareness will improve by engaging in a series of culturally responsive professional learning opportunities in order to improve the relationship between the school and all interested community and family stakeholders.  |
| Rationale             | School climate survey results and trends reveal a need for a focus on developing staff understanding and capacity within culturally responsive frameworks in order to improve the educative experience for all subgroups of students.  |
| Intended<br>Outcome   | The number of Level 1 offenses will decrease by 100% from 65 referrals to 0 referrals as a result of increased student engagement.  The number of Level 2 offenses will decrease by 33% from 523 referrals to 350 referrals as a result of increased student engagement.  The number of Level 3 offenses will decrease by 68% from 482 referrals to 150 referrals as a result of increased student engagement.  Student school climate survey results will increase from 3.51 in 2017-2018 to 4.0 in 2018-2019.  Parent school climate survey results will increase from 3.96 in 2017-2018 to 4.50 in 2018-2019.  Staff school climate survey results will increase from 3.78 in 2017-2018 to 4.50 in 2018-2019.   |
| Point<br>Person       | Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@ocps.net)   |
| Action Step           |  |
| Description           | School-based leadership team will provide training and support to teachers on strategies to authentically engage students in learning tasks.  Principal will hire a staff representative of the culture and demographics of the school and community population.  Principal will hire support personnel purposed with providing additional layers of academic and social/emotional counseling at each grade-level.  School-based leadership team will implement ongoing culturally responsive professional learning opportunities.  Teachers will actively implement strategies and awarenesses developed from culturally responsive professional learning.  School-leadership will continually develop teacher capacity to remain objective and controlled within the learning environment.  School-leadership will monitor teacher expectations and relationships with all students.  School and district-based leadership teams will train teachers in culturally responsive teaching strategies in order to support the learning of all students.  Teachers will actively increase student engagement in standards-based learning by building and maintaining student relationships and positive learning environments.  School based leadership will monitor school referrals bi-weekly through the Enterprise Data Warehouse, as well as have a mandatory monthly meeting to discuss all discipline items. |
| Person<br>Responsible | Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@ocps.net)   |
| Plan to Monito        | or Effectiveness   |
| Description           | Administrators will actively monitor classroom instruction, trends in student engagement, and community climate survey results to evaluate the effectiveness of specific action steps in yielding intended outcomes.   |

Last Modified: 5/1/2024 Page 15 https://www.floridacims.org

Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@ocps.net)

Person

Responsible

### Part IV: Title I Requirements

#### Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

Westridge Middle School will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through the implementation of a variety of initiatives. Westridge Middle School will host a series of events purposefully aimed at connecting parents and the community to the educative process. Prior to the start of school, parents and students will be able to attend two separate events to obtain a digital device and their class schedule respectively. Parents and students will have access to information about important stakeholders at the school and opportunities Westridge offers. One community focused event will be hosted each semester of the 2018-2019 school year: Open House and Community Curriculum Night. Both of these events will support a partnership among the school, parents, and the community.

Westridge Middle School will host a series of Parent Teacher Association and School Advisory Council meetings each month throughout the school year in order to encourage and ensure active involvement of the parent voice in the direction of the school. Westridge Middle School will also develop more partners in education throughout the community with the purpose of providing students a direct connection between their school and their community.

Westridge Middle School will actively maintain communication with parents and the community through the introduction of a monthly newsletter and other vehicles of communication shared with parents and the community via the parent pick-up line, routine phone calls home, and social media.

#### **PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Westridge Middle School will reduce the number out-of-school suspensions (OSS). During the 2018-2019 school year, Restorative Justice (RJ) practices will continue to be incorporated in the school-wide discipline plan. This will include daily RJ sessions in the Positive Alternative to Student Suspension (PASS) program. In addition, RJ sessions will be included in any OSS plans. This program supports the reduction of OSS practices and allows for student learning in decision-making and conflict resolution. This program, through the continual collaboration between school stakeholders, (i.e. school administration, guidance counselors, and instructional support team members,) will continue to support students in positive development of their social-emotional needs.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

In May of every school year, school visits are scheduled with feeder elementary schools. The purpose of these visits is to orient students to the middle school environment, discuss class offerings, student involvement opportunities, and student scheduling. In addition, all incoming sixth grade students visit Westridge Middle School to learn about the school and participate in school tours led by current

students. Westridge is also visited annually near the end of the school year by the high schools it feeds into. This is to prepare Westridge students for high school by introducing them to academic and extracurricular opportunities at the high school level and allowing them to prepare their schedules for the upcoming school year.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The instructional leadership team will meet bi-weekly to review multi-tiered systems of support to determine needs of individual students. Student achievement and discipline data will be disaggregated and reviewed to identify students in need of specifically tiered academic and behavioral systems of support. Specific interventions for each tier of support will be identified and assigned to students. This information will be made available with all interested stakeholders.

The school will continue to receive support from district level MTSS administrators and coaches. The continued coaching will help to ensure that academic and behavior systems within the MTSS framework are working effectively to meet the needs of all students and that timely interventions are in place to support learning throughout the school.

Teachers will meet routinely with the express purpose of reviewing student performance on progress monitoring activities and common assessments to appropriately group students for forthcoming units of study. This process will be guided by the instructional leadership team.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Westridge Middle School promotes academic and career planning through the scheduling of students in appropriately rigorous coursework to support student matriculation toward postsecondary opportunity. Westridge Middle School has established partnerships with local state universities and schools in the state college system. Additionally, Westridge Middle School also maintains a connection to a local technical college. Students at all grade levels participate in field trips to visit and learn about these institutions.

Students have opportunities to be exposed to and develop skills in digital information technology and digital video production through course offerings and progressions at Westridge Middle School. Project Lead the Way (PLTW) will continue to provide students exposure to career options in STEM fields. The PLTW course progression will expose students to curriculums in the medical, aeronautics, engineering, forensic, and design fields. PLTW offers rigorous course options which prepare students for Advanced Placement STEM courses when they enter high school.

| Part V: Budget |              |
|----------------|--------------|
| Total:         | \$556,328.75 |