Westwood Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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 was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	77%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

Year	**2019-20**	**2018-19**	**2017-18**	**2016-17**
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burney, Daniel	Principal	Supervise staff, provide instructional leadership, communicate with school stakeholders, etc...
Guido, Kim	Assistant Principal	Supervise implementation of curriculum, testing, scheduling, student admissions, etc...
Hardy, David	Assistant Principal	Supervise school facilities, student services, instructional materials, etc...
Williams, Ernest	Dean	Implement discipline plan, educate students on school expectations, work with teachers to keep classrooms safe while maximizing all students' instructional time.
Fairchild, Caroline	Teacher, K-12	ELA Teacher
Falvey, Davis	Teacher, K-12	U.S. History Teacher
Darji, Christy	School Counselor	Implement PBIS plan, provide emotional and social support for students, educate students and staff regarding mental health, sensitivity, substance abuse, etc...

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 11/13/2017, Daniel Burney

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.*

2

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

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)	90%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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.	

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	296	331	322	0	0	0	0	949
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	34	40	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	32	30	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	38	19	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	11	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	83	72	0	0	0	0	220
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	82	62	0	0	0	0	219

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	67	92	68	0	0	0	0	227

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	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	13

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/28/2020

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	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

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	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

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**	
	(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	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%
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%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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		

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	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%	2
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%	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	68
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	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	75
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	47
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.

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 decreased by 9 points from the previous

year. Some factors may include teachers' inexperience when working with SWDs, attendance, suspensions, and
having a long-term sub in a general education 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, lack of prior knowledge, deficits in the curriculum, 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, lack of training, 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?

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing gains of the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math We believe that the success of the bottom quartile students has direct implications on the success of our entire student population.
Measurable Outcome:	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). Established tutoring support for students (before and after school). Co-teach math and ELA classes. AVID strategies (organizational skills with binders, and note taking strategies). Faculty / Staff mentor program.
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 Steps to Implement

Recognition of school-wide academic goals during faculty meetings, starting with pre-planning

Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

2. Bi-monthly (every two months) faculty professional development focused on ELA and math.

Person Responsible	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)

Professional Development centered around focused note taking, iReady, mentorship, and AVID strategies.

Person Responsible	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)

Departmental visits with technology coach.

Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

Assign 6th grade multiple-warning-indicator students to faculty and staff for mentoring purposes.

Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reducing the achievement gap in all curricular areas. 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.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the ELA and Math achievement gap by 3 percentage points. Increase AIMS scores in ELA and Math for African American Students by 10% from Q1 to Q3.
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 Steps to Implement

Recognition of school-wide academic goals during faculty meetings, starting with pre-planning.

Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

Professional development focused on equity.

Person Responsible	David Hardy (hardydl@gm.sbac.edu)

Include elements of African American history and culture in cross-curricular settings throughout the year.

Person Responsible	Bill Howell (howellwk@gm.sbac.edu)

Focus on restorative actions to keep students in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Ernest Williams (williamsec1@gm.sbac.edu)

Professional Development for faculty on unintentional targeting and implicit bias.

Person Responsible	David Hardy (hardydl@gm.sbac.edu)

Collaborative Planning days.

Person Responsible	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)

Look into reestablishing club day.

Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the use of multi-tiered system of supports and problem-solving processes with all students with and without disabilities. 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.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the suspension rate of students with disabilities by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Hardy (hardydl@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 Steps to Implement

Professional Development on Multi-Tiered System and Supports (MTSS)

Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

School-wide PBIS plan to support positive behavior.

Person Responsible	David Hardy (hardydl@gm.sbac.edu)

Develop and implement a MTSS team to monitor students

Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

Monthly EPT meetings

Person Responsible	David Hardy (hardydl@gm.sbac.edu)

Professional Development for FBAs and BIPs

Person Responsible	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students With Disabilities (as a subgroup) have under-performed at Westwood Middle School, achieving at a rate of 30%. We intend to ensure that these students' needs are being met both academically and behaviorally.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the federal index for SWD students by 11% to achieve the required 41% Increase AIMS scores in ELA and Math for African American Students by 15% from Q1 to Q3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady program Co-Teach classes within Science, Math, ELA, and Social Studies Data Analysis meetings between district personnel and faculty Professional Development addressing "rigor"
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady program will help scaffold and support ELA Co-Teach classes to offer further support and differentiation in the general education classroom setting Data Analysis meetings will help inform, examine and focus teachers to areas that need the most attention Professional Development will ensure that students are receiving the depth of material that they need in order to succeed while not overwhelming them with unnecessary extra work.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be placed into appropriate Co-teach classes for ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies support.

Person Responsible	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)

ELA teachers will implement iReady program to assist in reading growth and differentiation.

Person Responsible	Amy MacCord (maccoram@gm.sbac.edu)

Faculty will engage in professional development with the principal regarding "rigor".

Person Responsible	Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

District personnel will assist with faculty data chats to help focus their instruction.

Person Responsible	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The areas of focus in part A should suffice to address the other areas from 2E as well (e.g. increasing student instructional time and reading scores should also improve social studies scores).

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.

Our PBIS team and goals are the primary source for creating a positive school culture at Westwood Middle School. We are committed to seeing all discipline through an instructional lens, teaching students about expectations and rewarding instances of growth and exceptional behavior. Our SAC team has been and will continue to be involved in this endeavor. It represents a sampling of all stakeholders and continues to encourage Westwood leadership in the areas of PBIS and student academic growth. Recently, they approved the use of HERO software in order to track and communicate student behavior throughout the school year. It provides yet another link to stakeholders as we create a positive culture on campus. Further, we involve stakeholders from the community through events such as Science Night, Cambridge Open House, Meet the Teacher, and AVID Night. It is our intent that community members, parents, students, and faculty and staff should all know the goals of Westwood as well as the plans for reaching them.

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