Woodlands Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Woodlands Middle School

5200 LYONS RD, Lake Worth, FL 33467

https://wdms.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Jenifer Kuras   Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2019-20 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: A (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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 Palm Beach 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

Woodlands Middle School

5200 LYONS RD, Lake Worth, FL 33467

https://wdms.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	54%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.

Woodlands is a Cambridge International School dedicated to connecting, supporting, and accelerating our scholars to succeed and serve others.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Woodlands Middle School envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vela, Enrique	Principal	The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making to ensure: * a sound, effective academic program is in place * a process to address and monitor subsequent needs is created * a problem solving team (SBT) is assisting with academic and behavioral interventions * assessment of RtI skills of school staff is conducted * fidelity of implementation of intervention support is documented * adequate professional development to support the RtI framework is provided * effective communication with parents regarding SBT and RtI plans and activity occurs The assistant principals will: * contribute to the development of the intervention plans, assist in progress monitoring, collect data, and offer assistance * work with all departments to develop academic plans that challenge all students The ESE/ELL contacts will: * contribute to the development of intervention plans, assist is progress monitoring, collect data, implement interventions when required, and offer professional development and assistance to teachers The Guidance Counselors will: * work with the SwPBS Internal Coach and the Middle School Course Recovery Coordinator to develop the programs * contribute to the development of intervention plans, assist in progress monitoring, collect data, implement interventions when required, and offer professional development and assistance to teachers
Gamez, Rigo	Assistant Principal	
Breaux, Dionne	Assistant Principal	
Dias, Daiana	School Counselor	
Brooks, Brian	Teacher, ESE	
Gillard, Sharese	Assistant Principal	
Leiva, Melissa	Dean	Testing, SIP, Cambridge Coordinator, Instructional Coaching
Henning, Kayce		

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/1/2017, Jenifer Kuras

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

13

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

95

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2019-20 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: A (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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.

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	568	499	469	0	0	0	0	1536
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	8	22	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	46	54	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	46	0	0	0	0	112
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	24	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	65	61	0	0	0	0	190
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	79	61	0	0	0	0	211
ELA Winter Diagnostic Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	195	195	0	0	0	0	570
Math Winter Diagnostic Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	143	125	0	0	0	0	435

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	86	90	69	0	0	0	0	245

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/19/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	568	499	469	0	0	0	0	1536
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	17	15	0	0	0	0	54
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	4	6	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	92	86	0	0	0	0	268

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	4	6	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	568	499	469	0	0	0	0	1536
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	17	15	0	0	0	0	54
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	4	6	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	92	86	0	0	0	0	268

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	4	6	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	62%	58%	54%	58%	56%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	56%	54%	55%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	47%	41%	48%	44%
Math Achievement	70%	62%	58%	72%	61%	56%
Math Learning Gains	59%	60%	57%	71%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	53%	51%	52%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	62%	52%	51%	55%	53%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	75%	72%	77%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	64%	58%	6%	54%	10%
	2018	56%	53%	3%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	53%	6%	52%	7%
	2018	59%	54%	5%	51%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	58%	58%	0%	56%	2%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	69%	60%	9%	55%	14%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	52%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	29%	35%	-6%	54%	-25%
	2018	20%	39%	-19%	54%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
08	2019	63%	64%	-1%	46%	17%
	2018	65%	65%	0%	45%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	60%	51%	9%	48%	12%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	50%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	78%	72%	6%	71%	7%
2018	74%	72%	2%	71%	3%
Compare		4%			
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	95%	64%	31%	61%	34%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	97%	62%	35%	62%	35%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	60%	38%	57%	41%
2018	99%	57%	42%	56%	43%
Compare		-1%			

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	22	35	29	29	43	38	25	45	73		
ELL	29	50	47	42	49	36	27	44	76		
ASN	72	69	82	88	65		67	80	96		
BLK	44	51	47	54	52	39	46	70	86		
HSP	61	58	43	64	57	48	56	81	85		
MUL	64	54		74	54		73	77	100		
WHT	74	64	46	82	66	57	75	89	94		
FRL	52	55	44	60	55	42	50	71	88		

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	19	42	39	29	42	29	28	39			
ELL	13	40	40	34	45	42		53			
ASN	67	65		86	75		83	82	100		
BLK	39	48	42	56	55	47	45	71	93		
HSP	56	52	41	69	64	52	61	75	91		
MUL	60	56	55	78	80		57	72	94		
WHT	73	58	46	84	72	60	81	83	94		
FRL	48	51	39	64	60	48	55	71	89		

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	34	30	22	41	37	14	35			
ELL	16	30	25	33	50	37	20	28			
ASN	70	61		86	76		80	75	100		
BLK	37	40	30	60	66	48	38	59	84		
HSP	49	50	39	63	65	50	42	72	83		
MUL	69	60		81	80			79	100		
WHT	73	66	60	82	76	58	69	90	86		

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
FRL	45	48	38	62	65	50	41	67	82		

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	64
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	635
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

When looking at the subgroup data over the last two years, our SWD population has the lowest achievement overall. Based on the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) data our focus going forward needs to be on the overall performance of our Students with Disabilities (SWD).

The following proficiency levels from FY19 FSA, the content areas of focus for the improvement of SWD performance will be English Language Arts (proficiency was 22%), Mathematics (proficiency was 29%) and Science (proficiency was 25%). Based on these data trends our focus will be to diminish course failure and increase learning gains in each content area by providing support to the students by focusing on foundational skills and scaffolding instruction with our coteacher support in the students content area classes.

Midyear data shows that we still have room to grow and with the lack of data of the FY20 state assessments, we will continue to focus on these goals for the FY21 school year.

In ELA we see that we have approximately 32% levels 1s and 2s n 6th grade, in 7th grade we have 39% level 1s & 2s, and in 8th grade we have 43% scoring level 1s & 2s.

In Mathematics 6th grade has approximately 30% of students scoring a level 1 or 2, in 7th grade 42% of students scored a level 1 or 2 and in 8th grade 66% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on the Math Diagnostic.

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

Based on the FY19 FSA, the greatest decline from the previous year was in overall performance in 7th grade math, where our school scored 25% below the state average and 6% below the district.

The data components which shows the decline are:

*Math learning gains declined from 66% in 2018 to 59% in 2019, resulting in a 7% decline.
*Math lowest 25 decreased from 53% in 2018 to 47% in 2019, resulting in a 6% decline.

In Mathematics 6th grade has approximately 30% of students scoring a level 1 or 2, in 7th grade 42% of students scored a level 1 or 2 and in 8th grade 66% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on the Math Diagnostic.

The contributing factor to this decline was a decrease in the amount of support given to students in the lowest quartile, SWD, and ELL students.

During the midyear, we see our Math scores either stayed the same or had a slight increase, our focus this year is to ensure we have our coteachers placed in content area classes to support the students of highest needs, specifically our students with disabilities.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap when compared to the state data was math performance in 7th grade, where our school scored 25% below the state average.

The contributing factor to this gap was that while we had a focus on acceleration we needed to provide a greater level of support to those in the lowest 25%. Our lowest 25% went from 53% in 2018 to 47% in 2019.

Our math achievement dropped from 73% in 2018 to 70% in 2019.

During our FY20, we enhanced our coteacher support into content area classes to support our students in the highest needs, however, because the lack of data due to COVID19 we are unable to

review data for growth from the FSA.

Our FY20 data from our USAs and FSQs have supported our focus on the following:

1.) Incorporating small groups instruction to support students learning
2.) Using Technology to enhance students' ability to integrate knowledge.
3.) PLCs will ensure teachers work together collaboratively to develop data driven instruction for all students.
4.) Remediation will be provided through bell ringers.

We are seeing an upward trend based on our review of last years data and data chats. We will compare last years diagnostics to this years fall diagnostics to better gauge our starting point for continuous improvement.

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

Our performance on the Civics, Algebra, and Geometry EOCs was higher than the district and the state.

Civics increased their EOC perfromance from 74% in 2018 to 78% in 2019. Civics scored higher than the district by 6% in 2019.

Algebra out performed the district by 31% in 2019.

Geometry out performed the district by 38% in 2019.

Our teachers focused on planning, additional support (before school), and review of material that is meaningful to serve all students specifically our SWDs in the mainstream environment with the extra support of a second ESE Facilitator in the room will enable teachers to more effectively implement small group instruction to differentiate their needs.

Targeted instruction is effective because teaching is focused precisely on individual student needs and it provides a more intense and consistent method of monitoring student progress.

1.) Incorporate small groups and aggressively monitoring students will identify areas if weakness for targeted remediation. Teachers will utilize USAs and FSQs as well as questioning techniques to prepare students for the FSA.

2.) Reading Plus has been a valuable resource to increase student achievement. Scores have increased with the use of this program.

3.) PLCs allow teachers to work collaboratively to analyze data and to make data driven decisions to improve student progress.

4.) Remediation is essential in standard based instruction. The use of bell ringers will provide teachers an opportunity to remediate and review material on a daily basis with their students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our two areas of concern after reviewing the EWS data are:

1.) Performance of the lowest 25% in Math.

Math learning gains declined from 66% in 2018 to 59% in 2019, resulting in a 7% decline. Math lowest 25 decreased from 53% in 2018 to 47% in 2019, resulting in a 6% decline. Based on this data trend our focus will be to increase learning gains and achievement in our lowest 25% while focusing on the 7th grade students in math. Our data suggests a focus in remediation of standards, foundational skills, while scaffolding instruction that meets the full intent and rigor of standards in all content areas. SWD students will be targeted through various modes of instruction, including technology, small groups, tutorials, data chats and student monitoring.

2.) SWD Population

While some grade components for the SWD subgroup improved it is evident that our focus needs to be in support of our students with disabilities. If we are unsuccessful in addressing skill deficits then students will not be able to perform at their highest level of achievement. Teaching foundational skills and remediation of standards will increase the level of performance of our SWD. The use of the coteach method will provide support to our students in their content level classes.

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

At Woodlands Middle School we focus on student achievement, standard based instruction, student learning gains, equity for all learners and overall social and emotional growth. We believe if we dedicate time to the following priorities we will ensure an equitable and equal opportunity for all students by positively influencing:

*A Clear Path to Success
*Engagement
*Data Driven Instruction
*Self Care
*Providing Challenges
*Accelerated Learning Opportunities
*Support for all Learners

1.) Performance of lowest 25% in Mathematics-ensure learning gains.

We analyzed data to identify which students fall in this category. The math teachers will use small group instruction and aggressive monitoring to ensure these students progress in mathematics. Our new math teachers will participate in the district's PLP and will be coached as they are new to the district. We worked with our local feeder school to identify students that are in need of additional support and also to provide accelerated course for those that have not been given the opportuinity.

2.) Performance of SWD and ELL students in ELA and Mathematics.

Teachers will collaborate in PLC'S to review FSQ and USA data to review standards and breakdown the item analysis reports. Teachers will collaborate and remediate standards through the use of bell ringers in each content area class. Our students enter with large deficiencies in reading comprehension and writing, which impede the scores. The district's Content Literacy Strategies will be used in each content area to support the building of literacy skills. Teachers will focus on remediation and practice foundation skills to increase cognitive development. The use of the technology resources of Reading Plus and Math Nation will support our students learning and development.

3.) Improvement in all content areas decreasing the number of failures.

We are focused on providing opportunities for all our students by offering accelerated classes as well as additional support classes. The master board was collaboratively developed to sustain maximum growth in all content areas. Teachers are provided additional support of coteachers that can help develop models of instruction in small group and remediation.

Standards Based Instruction will be a primary focus during instruction planning sessions such as PLCs. Teachers will review data to drive instruction. Resources and strategies will be aligned to grade level standards and support will be provided to students not performing at their grade level. Increasing student engagement through technology resources and our Cambridge model of instruction will help learners take ownership of their learning and build relationships with their peers that will motivate them to participate in lessons and work collaboratively to reach their goals.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When looking at the subgroup data over the last two years, our SWD population has the lowest achievement overall. Based on the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) data our focus going forward needs to be on the overall performance of our Students with Disabilities (SWD). The following proficiency levels from FY19 FSA, the content areas of focus for the improvement of SWD performance will be English Language Arts (proficiency was 22%), Mathematics (proficiency was 29%) and Science (proficiency was 25%). Based on these data trends our focus will be to diminish course failure and increase learning gains in each content area by providing support to the students by focusing on foundational skills and scaffolding instruction with our coteacher support in the students content area classes. To ensure student academic improvement in all academic areas on all state assessments in alignment with LTO 2, High School Readiness, and LTO 3, HS Graduation Rate. With a keen focus on the progress and support of ESE and ELL students both through academic and social support.
Measurable Outcome:	By FY21, we will improve to the following levels of proficiency ELA 67% Civics 82% Math 75% Science 69%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Enrique Vela (enrique.vela@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through a focused approach to planning, instructing, assessing, and supporting all students the overall performance of all content areas will increase.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of co-teach model of instruction in all content areas to support students at various levels of performance will provide all students; especially the lowest 25%, ESE, and ELL students with gains over the previous year. Based on our needs to improve the performance of the targeted students small group instruction will support students at their present levels and provide teachers with and opportunity to differentiate to meet the needs of all students. Overall content area improvements of 5% will be achieved with the following strategies in critical content areas:

Action Steps to Implement

Civics - the use of iCivics to support students and improve performance

Person Responsible	Sharese Gillard (sharese.gillard@palmbeachschools.org)

Science - an increase focus on vertical planning to support the assessed grade level.

Person Responsible	Rigo Gamez (rigo.gamez@palmbeachschools.org)

Math - a focus on academic vocabulary, PD for teachers, focused note taking, and monitoring of the PLC meetings

Person Responsible Dionne Breaux (dionne.breaux@palmbeachschools.org)

ELA - data chats with teacher and administration, and students, differentiation of instruction and expectations.

Person Responsible Sharese Gillard (sharese.gillard@palmbeachschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If we focus on standards-based instruction to increase learning gains in school-wide Math, then we will increase student achievement to ensure student improvement in mathematics on all state assessments in alignment with LTO2, High School Readiness. Based on the FY19 FSA, the greatest decline from the previous year was in overall performance in 7th grade math, where our school scored 25% below the state average and 6% below the district. The data components which shows the decline are: *Math learning gains declined from 66% in 2018 to 59% in 2019, resulting in a 7% decline. *Math lowest 25 decreased from 53% in 2018 to 47% in 2019, resulting in a 6% decline.
Measurable Outcome:	By FY21, Woodlands Middle School student in the lowest quartile for math will increase their overall proficiency of the Math FSA by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Enrique Vela (enrique.vela@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A targeted model of instruction will be implemented to differentiate the instructional needs of students. A Co-Teach Model to support all students, specifically our ESE and ELL students in the learning environment with specific adaptations and differentiated instruction for each student . 1.) Incorporate small groups instruction to support students learning 2.) Math Teachers will use Math Nation enhance students' ability to integrate knowledge. 3.) PLCs will ensure teachers work together collaboratively to develop data driven instruction for all students. 4.) Remediation will be provided through bell ringers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted instruction is effective because teaching is focused precisely on individual student needs and it provides a more intense and consistent method of monitoring student progress. 1.) Incorporate small groups and aggressively monitoring students will identify areas if weakness for targeted remediation. Teachers will utilize USAs and FSQs as well as questioning techniques to prepare students for the FSA. 2.) Math Nation as been a valuable resource to increase student achievement. Scores have increased with the use of this program. 3.) PLCs allow teachers to work collaboratively to analyze data and to make data driven decisions to improve student progress. 4.) Remediation is essential in standard based instruction. The use of bell ringers will provide teachers an opportunity to remediate and review material on a daily basis with their students.

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Incorporate Small Group Instruction
a. Students will be assessed with USAs and FSQs
b.Teachers will analyze student data
c. Teachers will group students with a rotational cycle
d. Monitoring will occur through data results and learning walks

2.) Adaptive Technology
a. Teachers will be trained in the use of technology
b. Teachers will collaboratively plan and analyze data

3.) PLCs and Professional Development
a. Development of a PLC Schedule
b. Data Driven Discussion
c. Professional Development on how to read and breakdown data components

4.) Remediation of Standards Based Instruction
a. Teachers will analyze the results of USAs, FSQs and District Diagnostics to determine the areas of concern.
b. Teachers will work collaboratively to develop questions from the assessments to remediate standards.
c. Bell ringers will be developed and utilized on a daily basis in each grade level

Person Responsible   Dionne Breaux (dionne.breaux@palmbeachschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a gap in ELA proficiency between SWDs and their non-disabled counterparts. To ensure improvement for SWDs in ELA on all state assessments in alignment with LTO 2, High School Readiness.
Measurable Outcome:	Our measurable goals for FY21 will be to have a 10% increase in proficiency in our SWD subgroup in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Enrique Vela (enrique.vela@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A targeted model of instruction will be implemented to differentiate the instructional needs of students. A Co-Teach Model to support all students, specifically our ESE and ELL students in the learning environment with specific adaptations and differentiated instruction for each student . 1.) Incorporate small groups instruction to support students learning 2.) ELA Teachers will use Reading Plus to enhance students' ability to integrate knowledge. 3.) PLCs will ensure teachers work together collaboratively to develop data driven instruction for all students. 4.) Remediation will be provided through bell ringers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Serving students with disabilities in the mainstream environment with the extra support of a second ESE Facilitator in the room will enable teachers to more effectively implement small group instruction to differentiate their needs. Targeted instruction is effective because teaching is focused precisely on individual student needs and it provides a more intense and consistent method of monitoring student progress. 1.) Incorporate small groups and aggressively monitoring students will identify areas if weakness for targeted remediation. Teachers will utilize USAs and FSQs as well as questioning techniques to prepare students for the FSA. 2.) Reading Plus has been a valuable resource to increase student achievement. Scores have increased with the use of this program. 3.) PLCs allow teachers to work collaboratively to analyze data and to make data driven decisions to improve student progress. 4.) Remediation is essential in standard based instruction. The use of bell ringers will provide teachers an opportunity to remediate and review material on a daily basis with their students.

Action Steps to Implement

An inclusive co-teaching model will be implemented in ELA classes.
a. Master board collaboratively designed
b. Teachers trained on the co-teaching model

c. Model co teachers present lessons to other teachers
d. Training for teachers by ESE Coordinator

Person Responsible   Enrique Vela (enrique.vela@palmbeachschools.org)

1.) Incorporate Small Group Instruction
a. Students will be assessed with USAs and FSQs
b.Teachers will analyze student data
c. Teachers will group students with a rotational cycle
d. Monitoring will occur through data results and learning walks

2.) Adaptive Technology
a. Teachers will be trained in the use of technology
b. Teachers will collaboratively plan and analyze data

3.) PLCs and Professional Development
a. Development of a PLC Schedule
b. Data Driven Discussion
c. Professional Development on how to read and breakdown data components

4.) Remediation of Standards Based Instruction
a. Teachers will analyze the results of USAs, FSQs and District Diagnostics to determine the areas of concern.
b. Teachers will work collaboratively to develop questions from the assessments to remediate standards.
c. Bell ringers will be developed and utilized on a daily basis in each grade level

Person Responsible   Sharese Gillard (sharese.gillard@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42; continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas.

Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of the Holocaust
The History of Black and African Americans
The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics
The Contributions of Women
The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols and monitoring SwPBS through data.

In alignment, to School Board 2.09 and Florida State statute 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures.

In order to promote college and career readiness, the school implements Advancement Via Individualized Determination (AVID) school-wide strategies as well as an AVID elective class.

Our school will implement a new daily Social Emotional Learning curriculum in a daily Mustang Meeting for all students.

To ensure the positive climate at Woodlands, our School-Wide Positive Behavior Systems (SwPBS) will continue to implement the Mustang PRIDE and Character Counts recognition programs for students and staff.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Woodlands Middle School is dedicated to creating a culture that ensures a safe and supportive climate that meets the needs of all students and families

Building a culture with high expectations and collaboration instills the belief of Woodlands Middle School's Mission Statement. Promoting shared decision making and soliciting feedback from teachers, students, families, and stakeholders are essential in building relationships to enhance the programs and accessibility for all students to succeed and maintain a high level of performance academically, emotionally, and socially.

In order to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders, the school will continue to facilitate SAC, PTSO, Curriculum Night, Academy Showcases, Student Recognition Ceremonies, and Open House events. We will utilize our Community Language Facilitators and translation resources to connect with parents with limited English proficiency.

The Academic School Leadership Team, facilitated by the Principal, conducts bi-weekly meetings to identify student needs and make recommendations for resource allocation and student programming. The Leadership Team also monitors student progress and inventory of resources. In addition, the School Advisory Council, facilitated by the School Advisory Council Chairperson, meets monthly to discuss school-wide student performance and make collective decisions for the use of SAC funds to supplement the available classroom resources.

The school ensures social and social-emotional needs by implementing a comprehensive school counseling program, including individual and group counseling. We will continue our Mustang Mentoring programs. Teachers will implement our SEL curriculum through daily Mustang Meetings. The addition of SEL Mustang Meetings has built trust and relationships between students and adults.

The school implements the Advancement Via Individualized Determination (AVID) school-wide strategies and elective class to promote college and career readiness. The school maintains community-based partnerships that collaborate with our Information Technology, Culinary, and Pre-Medical programs.

Our business partners and our school create a mutually beneficial partnership based on the needs of the school. In exchange for recognition by the school, appreciation events, communication of school activities, etc, the business partner will donate or offer discounted goods or services.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$4,998.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3336	120-Classroom Teachers	1921 - Woodlands Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$4,998.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
					Total:	$4,998.00