

Orange County Public Schools

West Oaks Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Oaks Elementary

905 DORSCHER RD, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://westoakes.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Elaine Lundberg

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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 below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (38%) 2014-15: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Orange 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Oaks Elementary

905 DORSCHER RD, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://westoakes.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	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 <https://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.

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 producers 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Thompson, Cherie	Principal	Principal, Cherie Thompson: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, provides clear direction by establishing measurable goals and establishes a positive school culture. Mrs. Thompson ensures that the school-based teams are implementing research-based instructional strategies focused on the work of improving academic achievement. Mrs. Thompson monitors the use of common assessments and ensures data is analyzed, interpreted, and used to drive classroom instruction. Mrs. Thompson establishes instructional teams who collaborate regularly, provides professional development opportunities addressing school improvement focus areas and provides support through the use of instructional coaches and modeling. Ms. Thompson also allows for opportunities for students, parents, staff, and the community to provide input regarding the function of the school and engages families in a variety of learning and relationship-building activities throughout the school year.
Barnes, April	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach and Science Coach, Ms. April Barnes Ms. Barnes, the instructional coach works collaboratively with the school-based problem-solving teams to develop and implement training, coach and support teachers, and participate in collaborative planning. Ms. Barnes also serves as the science coach to facilitate the management and interpretation of data necessary to develop, implement and evaluate science instruction across the grade levels. Ms. Barnes also coordinates our mentee and mentor program for teachers with less than three years of experience or those new to our school.
Karimi, Aki	Other	Staffing Specialist, Aki Karimi: The staffing specialists, Ms. Karimi, facilitates and provides training to school staff regarding ESE procedures, least restrictive environment, and other items related to students with disabilities. Ms. Karimi serves as a liaison and expert on school board, state and federal laws related to special education services. Assists in the development and implementation of student IEPs to ensure accuracy and appropriate services and accommodations are provided. Participates in student data collection integrates core instructional activities/materials into tier 3 instruction and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.
Murray, Regina	Instructional Coach	Math Coaches, Regina Murray (Grades K-2): Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes the existing literature on scientifically-based curriculum and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of students' need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered at risk; assists in the design and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.</p>
<p>Tyler, Thomas</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<p>Math Coaches, Thomas Tyler (Grades 3-5): Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes the existing literature on scientifically-based curriculum and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of students' need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered at risk; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.</p>
<p>Lundberg, Elaine</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>Assistant Principal, Elaine Lundberg: Develops documents necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data analysis, management and implementation to drive instruction. Provides guidance on the K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of tier 1, 2 and 3 intervention plans. Monitors, provides actional feedback, and ensures accountability of the MAO initiatives and Culturally Responsive School Plan. This section is:</p>
<p>Garcia, Susan</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<p>Instructional Coach and Science Coach, Ms. Susan Garcia Ms. Garcia, the instructional coach works collaboratively with the school-based problem-solving teams to develop and implement training, coach and support teachers, and participate in collaborative planning. Ms. Garcia also serves as the reading coach to facilitate the management and interpretation of data necessary to develop, implement and evaluate reading and writing instruction across the grade levels. Ms. Garcia also coordinates our mentee and mentor program for teachers with less than three years of experience or those new to our school.</p>

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	60	82	87	114	96	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	16	9	9	15	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	9	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	4	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	59	45	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	1	1	1	20	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	7	8	16	12	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	3	1	4	7	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	5	0	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	52	30	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	2	1	3	13	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	7	8	16	12	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	3	1	4	7	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	5	0	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	52	30	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	2	1	3	13	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	45%	57%	57%	44%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	58%	55%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	53%	47%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	63%	63%	43%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	61%	62%	56%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	51%	59%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	56%	53%	35%	50%	51%

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	60 (0)	82 (0)	87 (0)	114 (0)	96 (0)	90 (0)	529 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	16 (7)	9 (8)	9 (16)	15 (12)	5 (7)	9 (9)	63 (59)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	0 (1)	3 (4)	9 (7)	1 (4)	3 (3)	16 (22)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (5)	4 (5)	0 (0)	6 (6)	1 (3)	1 (2)	13 (21)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	59 (52)	45 (30)	26 (45)	130 (127)

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	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
	2018	33%	55%	-22%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	57%	-21%	58%	-22%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
	2018	40%	61%	-21%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	63%	-26%	64%	-27%
	2018	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
	2018	32%	59%	-27%	61%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	48	63	11	31	35					
ELL	39	43	56	39	58	64	56				
BLK	43	52	68	46	48	48	57				
HSP	52	50		45	50						
FRL	41	50	61	45	48	50	62				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	7	31	31	4	27	40					
ELL	40	70	63	40	56	54	29				
BLK	45	58	47	45	46	42	45				
HSP	48	83		38	67						
FRL	46	61	50	44	50	47	46				
2017 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		19	18	11	38	38					
ELL	28	46	45	40	53	52	6				
BLK	46	58	49	43	56	65	34				
HSP	15	23		25	46						
FRL	44	55	47	43	56	59	35				

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	53
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Based on 2019 Florida State Assessment (FSA) data, the data component that shows the lowest performance is the students with disabilities subgroup with only 13% of students with disabilities performing on grade level in ELA and 11% performing on grade level in math as assessed by the Florida State Assessment. Trends that were observed within this subgroup also show that many of our fully-mainstreamed students perform slightly below grade level on state assessments. Analyzing data and making the necessary adjustment to address the learning gaps and access to grade-level standards while building a culture of collaboration between ESE and non-ESE teachers will be important for the upcoming school year.

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 the 2017-2018 school year, would be included in our grade-level data, specifically fourth grade. Our fourth grade-level team performing at 51% in both reading and math for the 2017-2018 school year declined to 36% in ELA and 37% in math during the 2018-2019 school year. One of the factors that may have contributed to this decline is that the cohort of students started substantially behind the previous year's cohort and needed a more targeted and systematic intervention plan to address many academic concerns. Another contributing factor may be the level of teacher experience particularly in the knowledge of the Florida Standards and the district instructional model.

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.

Our math achievement data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The math achievement at our school is at 47% while the state average is at 63%, which is a difference of 16%. This gap increases to a 27% deficit among our fourth grade in the grade-level data analysis. Knowledge and comfort level of the Florida math standards by our teachers is a contributing factor to this gap. Also, closer monitoring of student achievement through common assessments and collaborative data analysis is needed for us to clearly identify the specific math needs of our students and support them through the MTSS process and appropriate use of interventions.

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

Our science achievement level is the data component that showed the most improvement with a 14% increase during the 2018-2019 school year. We contribute the use of standard-aligned curriculum as a foundation for instruction, the increased use of technology and hands-on learning opportunities, and consistent analysis of student common assessments to drive instruction as important factors leading to our success. Another contributing factor is the quality of collaboration and communication among our fifth-grade team, science coach, and administration during common planning and data analysis. Finally, the implementation of adjustments to improve student outcomes and to clear any misconceptions through the use of specific instructional practices and interventions was also a large contributor to the success in this area.

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

One area of concern, as identified through the EWS data, would be the total of students scoring a level 1 on the statewide state assessments. The second concern would be the number of students whose attendance falls below 90%.

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

1. Increasing the proficiency of our students with disabilities.
2. Increasing math achievement levels across all grade levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase overall student proficiency in reading, math, and science.
Rationale	While we increase learning gains, we continue to perform below our goal in the percentage of students meeting grade-level achievement expectations. We continue to perform below district and state average in students achieving at or above grade level on FSA assessment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through collaborative planning and implementing strategies learned at DPLC, teachers will increase the implementation of close reading, text-based question strategies, and student collaboration as measured by classroom walkthroughs and documented in i-Observation. By May, as assessed by FSA, Statewide Science Assessment, and i-Ready, the number of students meeting grade-level proficiency will increase by 5% in each subject area ELA, Math, and Science across grades 3-5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cherie Thompson (cherie.thompson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing teacher knowledge and use of complex texts, close reading strategies, text-based questions, and student collaboration we will be able to meet the depth of the standard(s) and meet our goal for student achievement in ELA, Math, and Science. Along with instructional coaches and District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) members, teachers will be able to confidently implement strategies and ensure students are reaching grade level. This will be monitored through common planning, classroom visits, and analysis of common trend data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students use of conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others allows students to strategically extend learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepening knowledge.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongoing professional development opportunities will be provided to address needs based on student achievement, classroom walkthrough, and evaluation data trends to support our area of focus. These professional development opportunities may include how to increase the use of complex text, implementation of close reading strategies, creating text-based questions, and increasing student collaboration. 2. Plan collaboratively and deliberately to address choosing appropriate text, creation of text-dependent questions, implementation of close read strategies, culturally responsive instruction, and student collaboration. 3. Continuous and planned open classroom observational opportunities will allow for the collection of data on the implementation of learned strategies, trend feedback for teachers, and inform our coaching cycle as well as the professional development plan. 4. Instructional coaches and DPLC team members will follow the professional learning cycle to provide differentiated support to teachers as needed.
Person Responsible	Cherie Thompson (cherie.thompson@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	To narrow the achievement gap through differentiated and culturally responsive instruction and effective implementation of the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) process.
Rationale	Limited understanding of the MTSS process to successfully differentiate instruction and use culturally responsive instruction to close the achievement gap as evident in our ESE and lowest 25% subgroup's learning gains on FSA and district assessments.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By targeting specific and individualized needs of our students, overall student achievement will increase by 5% in both ELA and Math. By May, as assessed by FSA (3-5) and iReady (K-5), scores will indicate an increase of students meeting grade-level proficiency expectations, specifically among our students with disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cherie Thompson (cherie.thompson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions through small group instruction and cooperative learning strategies. The strategy will be monitored through weekly common planning with assigned leadership members, weekly classroom walk-throughs, teacher observation data, and student assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction between the teacher, the students, and the content.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coaches will facilitate common planning with teachers to support grade-level teams in developing culturally responsive instruction, differentiated small-group center activities and teacher-guided lessons to meet the needs of all students. 2. In direct response to our ESSA outcomes regarding our students with disabilities, Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) indicators and results will be shared with the staff and inform changes in our instruction practice. 3. In direct response to our ESSA outcomes regarding our students with disabilities, we will build a culture of collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) to increase student academic, behavioral, and social-emotional success. 4. In response to ESSA outcomes regarding students with disabilities, we will increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports related to our area of focus by deliberately planning these supports prior to the lesson by collaborating with ESE professionals. 5. Teachers study their practice to improve student learning through the analysis of data collection (formal and informal assessments, observations of student performance, and self-assessments) in regards to a culturally responsive classroom and differentiated instruction. 6. Use of model classrooms, co-teaching, and instructional coaching will be used as needed to address concerns or misconceptions with the implementation of instructional strategies and/or the MTSS process.
Person Responsible	Cherie Thompson (cherie.thompson@ocps.net)

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).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

At West Oaks Elementary we look at every interaction throughout the day as an opportunity to connect and build relationships with our families and stakeholders. Positive school communication and interaction with our families affect the extent of parents' involvement in their children's learning. In addition to our Meet the Teacher and Open House events, we have scheduled literacy, math, and STEM nights which encourages our families to come to learn alongside their children while having a good time and building positive relationships with our school staff. Our arts program also provides opportunities for students to grow, perform, and display their talents in their perspective areas which encourages family and community involvement. We also encourage families and other community stakeholders to attend both PTA and SAC meetings to provide input and allow for imperative two-way communication regarding school initiatives and school improvement goals.

Teachers are also encouraged to extend their communication to families by providing timely and consistent feedback on their child's progress and behavior while providing parents with actionable steps for improvement. Teachers are committed to regular phone calls, writing in agendas daily, and hosting conference nights to discuss report card grades, assessment data, and grade-level progress. Teachers nominate parents for a Parent of the Month award that spotlights our parents and provides an opportunity to strengthen school-home relationships.

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.

West Oaks has a social worker that coordinates appropriate services, provides small group instruction in social-emotional strategies, and participates in the MTSS process to provide strategies to support the needs of our students. We have a full-time counselor on campus in addition to our social worker. Our ESE teacher also provides small group social skills training to our ESE students. Our Threat Assessment Team meets monthly to discuss any potential threats to school safety and displayed behaviors by students that may warrant additional social-emotional support.

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

The instructional support coaches will work to develop a vertical collaborative partnership with Pre-K and Kindergarten teachers. This team will identify the academic and social skills necessary for Kindergarten readiness, along with a developmental plan and timeline for accomplishing the skills. At mid-year, the

teams will meet to evaluate and revise their plan as needed. The Pre-K teacher will also meet with Pre-K parents to share the upcoming school years' expectations, the academic and social strengths of their Pre-K student and early signs of difficulties, if applicable.

Each spring, neighboring students who attend area daycare facilities or participate in Head Start programs near the school, are invited to visit our campus and learn the various curriculum we utilize to meet state standards. All parents are invited to join their son/daughter on campus at Meet the Teacher and during the first day of school to familiarize themselves with school procedures.

Fifth-grade students are visited by teachers and guidance counselors from the middle school to share school policies, procedures and information regarding core courses and electives. In addition, 5th-grade students visit the feeder middle school for a tour and orientation in the spring each 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 MTSS Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction; facilitated the development of a systematic approach to teaching, and aligned processes and procedures. The MTSS team meets on a bi-weekly basis with teachers and the administrative team. During this time, the team reviews and discusses student data and interventions that were put in place to determine if they are working.

Title I funding affords the opportunity to provide Before/After/Saturday School Tutoring for students in grades second-fifth. During tutoring, students will be provided with instruction in the following subjects: Reading, math, writing, and science. Eight to ten teachers in grades 2nd-5th will instruct students on grade-level standards in the above-mentioned areas. Materials used for the program are researched-based material, "Keep on Reading/Math" from People's Publishing Company. Students will be given a pre/post assessment along with unit assessments to determine if they are making academic progress. All data will be compared with students not attending the tutoring program to determine if tutoring is effective. After reviewing the data, instructional decisions will be adjusted according to the data and shared with teachers and students.

SAI reading funds are used to purchase reading materials for the reading intervention groups. Items were purchased include Aspire Readin, ZOOM-In, and Specialized Program Individualizing Reading Excellence. These research-based Reading programs will allow our teachers to differentiate Reading skills for our students. Students will be given a pre/post assessment from each Reading program. Students new knowledge will be progressed monitored according to the specific program used and once data is received an adjustment to instruction will be made.

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

West Oaks Elementary School has culturally embedded AVID in all fifth-grade classes. AVID helps students prepare for college by teaching them higher-order thinking skills, self-advocacy, and organizational skills. Fifth- grade students make middle school transition visits in an effort to make more informed decisions regarding course requests and prepare for secondary education. West Oaks also

participates in TEACH-IN, inviting guests fifth-grade students to visit schools to learn about the many career path opportunities the schools have to offer students.