

Alachua County Public Schools

Westwood Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Westwood Middle School

1262 NW 31ST DRIVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/westwood>

Demographics

Principal: Daniel Burney

Start Date for this Principal: 11/13/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Alachua 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Westwood Middle School

1262 NW 31ST DRIVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/westwood>

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

Westwood Middle School creates an environment where all students are able to learn and achieve college and career readiness in a safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Westwood Middle School is a place where all students can learn to be college and career ready and achieve their potential.

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
Burney, Daniel	Principal	
Guido, Kim	Assistant Principal	
Hardy, David	Assistant Principal	
Wilson, Jeffrey	Dean	
Williams, Ernest	Dean	
Kanji, Jill	School Counselor	
Litchfield, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	
Booth, Leo	Teacher, K-12	
MacCord, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Nowaski, Jayanne	Teacher, ESE	
Charbonnet, Sara	Teacher, K-12	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	377	349	346	0	0	0	0	1072	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	29	31	0	0	0	0	98	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	45	38	0	0	0	0	97	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	55	0	0	0	0	108	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	96	120	0	0	0	0	335	

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	0	0	0	0	44	49	56	0	0	0	0	149

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	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	13

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

64

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/23/2019

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

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	55%	59%	54%	56%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	54%	55%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	41%	47%	40%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	57%	60%	58%	54%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	56%	57%	56%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	51%	43%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	56%	53%	51%	50%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	73%	72%	70%	72%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	377 (0)	349 (0)	346 (0)	1072 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	38 ()	29 ()	31 ()	98 (0)
One or more suspensions	14 (0)	45 (0)	38 (0)	97 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	26 (0)	27 (0)	55 (0)	108 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	119 (0)	96 (0)	120 (0)	335 (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
06	2019	53%	53%	0%	54%	-1%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	54%	-6%	52%	-4%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	51%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	56%	61%	-5%	56%	0%
	2018	54%	61%	-7%	58%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	59%	-3%	54%	2%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	54%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	21%	27%	-6%	46%	-25%
	2018	20%	24%	-4%	45%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	54%	54%	0%	48%	6%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	69%	-2%	71%	-4%
2018	60%	69%	-9%	71%	-11%
Compare		7%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	56%	28%	61%	23%
2018	80%	60%	20%	62%	18%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	48%	-48%	57%	-57%
2018	100%	63%	37%	56%	44%
Compare		-100%			

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	19	40	39	17	34	30	15	45			
ELL	26	47	42	34	55	51	28	60	91		
ASN	70	64		81	74		50				
BLK	32	39	35	33	37	31	33	44	77		
HSP	51	53	45	50	48	42	51	61	82		
MUL	51	57	42	61	59	60	45	76	79		
WHT	77	66	62	79	64	65	81	92	85		
FRL	39	44	36	39	43	37	40	56	74		
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	11	32	29	17	41	39	3	16			
ELL	20	51	40	32	50	32	15	27			
ASN	68	75		76	80		91		77		
BLK	34	42	35	34	46	41	36	45	51		
HSP	43	51	32	41	51	35	41	57	59		
MUL	50	49	29	61	65	57	47	65	90		
WHT	78	69	39	81	78	67	73	85	87		
FRL	39	46	34	40	52	44	41	48	68		

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	12	29	25	12	43	38	11	25			
ELL	18	44	38	33	57	48	9		58		
ASN	73	65		78	63			90	86		
BLK	31	41	36	30	44	40	26	51	57		
HSP	55	52	38	52	54	50	43	68	75		
MUL	51	53	42	52	55	36	60	61	58		
WHT	79	67	46	76	68	53	70	89	89		
FRL	36	42	34	32	47	42	30	56	55		

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	57
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	50
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	68
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
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.

Achievement for ELA, Math, and Science for our students with disabilities. This subgroup increased by 8 points in ELA and 12 points in science, but did not show a change for Math. The lowest quartile for this subgroup also decrease by 9 points from the previous year. Some factors may include teachers' inexperience when working with SWDs and having a long-term sub in a general education classroom and as the ESE teacher in a co-teacher classroom.

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

Both learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile students in math had the greatest decline, across most subgroups. Again, factors for this decrease may be due to teachers' inexperience with working with all students, and having long-term subs in positions for an extended period.

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 lowest 25th percentile scored 11% below the state average, and 6% below the district average. Some factors may include teachers' experiences teaching all students, teacher qualifications, and resources.

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

Our Social Studies Achievement had the greatest improvement with an overall increase of 8 points. All subgroups, with the exception of African American students (decreased by 1 point), increased by 4-33 points. We created schedules so that teachers had one main subject focus (single prep, i.e. Civics only).

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

The number of students earning a level 1 on statewide assessments, across all grade levels, and the number of students across all grade levels with two or more indicators.

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

1. Lowest Quartile Math
2. Students with Disabilities
3. African American Students
4. English Language Learners
5. Lowest Quartile ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing gains of the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math
Rationale	We believe that the success of the bottom quartile students has direct implications on the success of our entire student population.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile on the FSA by 6 percent points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using iReady with our lower quartile students (explicit reading instruction). Using IXL with our lower quartile students (math instruction). Tutoring support for students (before and after school). Co-teach math and ELA classes. AVID strategies (organizational skills with binders, and note taking strategies).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on our previous year's student achievement data (ESSA, FSA scores, AIMS), implementing these strategies will directly address areas of concern for our lowest quartile students by focusing on reading comprehension and reading fluency,
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognition of school-wide academic goals during faculty meetings, starting with pre-planning. 2. Bi-monthly faculty professional development focused on ELA and math. 3. Professional Development centered around focused note taking, iReady, and AVID strategies. 4. Departmental visits with technology coach.
Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

#2	
Title	Reducing the achievement gap in all curricular areas
Rationale	By reducing the achievement gap, more specifically by increasing the scores of our African American students, we will create a more equitable learning environment for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reduce the ELA and Math achievement gap by 3 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Restorative practice for discipline purposes. Teacher Professional Development for Culturally Responsive teaching. Providing extra supports to African American student who were placed in advanced course through AVID.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we are able to discipline students and correct behavior without keeping them out of class, they are exposed to more instructional time in the classroom. By providing teachers with profession development for culturally responsive teaching we are helping them to better teach all students. AVID allows for extra targeted support to all students in advanced courses.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognition of school-wide academic goals during faculty meetings, starting with pre-planning. 2. Professional development focused on equity. 3. Include elements of African American history and culture in cross-curricular settings throughout the year. 4. Focus on restorative actions to keep students in the classroom 5. Professional Development for faculty on unintentional targeting and implicit bias. 6. Collaborative Planning days
Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

#3	
Title	Increase the use of multi-tiered system of supports and problem-solving processes with all students with and without disabilities
Rationale	By providing students with tiered systems of support, and different problem-solving processes, we are able to support students both behaviorally and academically. The behavior support will help to keep students in the classroom which will help to increase their academic performance. MTSS will allow us to monitor student progress and implement different supports as needed.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the suspension rate of students with disabilities by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jill Kanji (kanjija@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS; acknowledge and reward positive behaviors across campus), EPT meetings (Educational Planning Teams; meetings to discuss students needs and to monitor their progress both academically and behaviorally), implementing FBAs and BIPs (Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavior Intervention Plan; identifying the targeted behavior issue and implementing a plan to reduce the problem behavior).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we identify the problem behavior and implement a plan to decrease the behavior, students will spend less time out of class for discipline reasons. By monitoring students progress monthly and rewarding students for positive behavior, we are keeping them in class and teaching the correct behaviors.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development on Multi-Tiered System and Supports (MTSS) 2. School-wide PBIS plan to support positive behavior 3. Develop and implement a MTSS team to monitor students 4. Monthly EPT meetings 5. Professional Development for FBAs and BIPs
Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

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 V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing gains of the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math					\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reducing the achievement gap in all curricular areas					\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	0141 - Westwood Middle School	Other		\$2,500.00	
			Notes: ADV funds				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase the use of multi-tiered system of supports and problem-solving processes with all students with and without disabilities					\$0.00
Total:							\$2,500.00