

The School District of Palm Beach County

Woodlands Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 28 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 29 |

Woodlands Middle School

5200 LYONS RD, Lake Worth, FL 33467

<https://wdms.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Jenifer Kuras

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 65% |
| 2020-21 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%) |
| 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 | |

* 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 29 |

Woodlands Middle School

5200 LYONS RD, Lake Worth, FL 33467

<https://wdms.palmbeachschools.org>

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 53% |
| 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 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | 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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Kuras, Jenifer | Principal | <p>The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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 Rtl skills of school staff is conducted * fidelity of implementation of intervention support is documented * adequate professional development to support the Rtl framework is provided * Effective communication with parents regarding SBT and Rtl plans and activity occurs <p>The assistant principals will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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 <p>The ESE/ELL contacts will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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 <p>The Guidance Counselors will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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 |
| Hartman, Dawn | Assistant Principal | |
| Gillard, Sharese | Assistant Principal | |
| Caplin, Daniel | Assistant Principal | |
| Brooks, Brian | Other | |
| Henning, Kayce | Other | |
| Dias, Daiana | School Counselor | |
| Turner, Mackenzie | Other | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, 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.*

12

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

98

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,559

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

12

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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 | 497 | 506 | 556 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1559 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 65 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 79 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 211 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 73 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 255 |
| FY21 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 297 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 741 |
| FY21 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224 | 254 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 615 |

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 | 82 | 56 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | |

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 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| 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

Thursday 9/9/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 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 | |

2020-21 - 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 | 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 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 62% | 58% | 54% | 59% | 56% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 56% | 54% | 54% | 57% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47% | 49% | 47% | 42% | 49% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 70% | 62% | 58% | 73% | 61% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 59% | 60% | 57% | 66% | 61% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47% | 53% | 51% | 53% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 62% | 52% | 51% | 66% | 55% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 80% | 75% | 72% | 77% | 75% | 72% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 58% | 6% | 54% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 53% | 6% | 52% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 58% | 0% | 56% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 60% | 9% | 55% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 29% | 35% | -6% | 54% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 64% | -1% | 46% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -29% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 51% | 9% | 48% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 78% | 72% | 6% | 71% | 7% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 95% | 64% | 31% | 61% | 34% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 98% | 60% | 38% | 57% | 41% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Progress monitoring allows teachers and administrators to track students' academic progress or growth across the entire school year. Teachers use student performance data to continually evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching and make more informed instructional decisions. If the rate at which a particular student is learning seems insufficient, the teacher can adjust instruction. Various reports will be used to monitor and support student learning:

In grades 6-8 we will use USAs in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Unit Standardized Assessments USAs gives teachers data on how well the students have mastered the standard. Supports the monitoring of student learning and provides ongoing feedback that instructors can use to make adjustments to instruction to improve student learning.

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 62.6 | 51.0 | 64.2 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52.4 | 41.1 | 52.8 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22.0 | 16.7 | 28.0 |
| | English Language Learners | 23.8 | 13.4 | 23.2 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 54.0 | 53.2 | 58.0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40.5 | 36.0 | 41.9 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 28.4 | 38.0 | 39.2 |
| | English Language Learners | 12.5 | 11.1 | 13.4 |
| Grade 7 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 57.0 | 47.7 | 49.6 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 46.3 | 34.1 | 36.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32.4 | 21.2 | 24.7 |
| | English Language Learners | 22.5 | 13.5 | 11.1 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 73.8 | 39.1 | 27.4 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 57.1 | 31.8 | 17.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 100.0 | 24.1 | 7.2 |
| | English Language Learners | | 19.1 | 3.9 |
| Civics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 84.1 | 82.2 | 84.0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 76.3 | 75.1 | 76.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 81.6 | 81.0 | 81.0 |
| | English Language Learners | 47.8 | 52.0 | 47.2 |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 72.8 | 73.1 | 70.9 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 66.5 | 64.9 | 61.9 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 34.5 | 34.4 | 34.9 |
| | English Language Learners | 27.0 | 30.8 | 25.6 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 47.5 | 26.3 | 27.4 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39.0 | 22.6 | 23.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13.3 | 6.3 | 7.9 |
| | English Language Learners | 15.4 | 12.5 | 14.3 |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 76.7 | 83.3 | 83.5 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 66.5 | 78.3 | 77.0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 45.2 | 52.4 | 56.3 |
| | English Language Learners | 38.5 | 55.0 | 60.5 |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 19 | 30 | 26 | 21 | 24 | 25 | 18 | 38 | 50 | | |
| ELL | 33 | 50 | 39 | 27 | 26 | 21 | 15 | 51 | 45 | | |
| ASN | 82 | 82 | 50 | 68 | 46 | | 67 | 95 | 79 | | |
| BLK | 43 | 50 | 42 | 33 | 31 | 28 | 40 | 56 | 56 | | |
| HSP | 55 | 50 | 30 | 50 | 31 | 23 | 46 | 69 | 67 | | |
| MUL | 63 | 64 | 33 | 58 | 46 | 27 | 67 | 63 | 64 | | |
| WHT | 69 | 53 | 40 | 62 | 37 | 29 | 64 | 81 | 79 | | |
| FRL | 48 | 48 | 36 | 40 | 31 | 26 | 44 | 60 | 64 | | |
| 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 | | |

| 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 |
| 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 | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 51 |
| 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 | 51 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 508 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 28 |
| 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 | 36 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 71 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 50 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 45 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

FSA (FY19) VS FSA (FY21)

ELA

6th Grade

FY19 (64) FY21 (63) DIFFERENCE (-1)

7th Grade

FY19 (59) FY21(54) DIFFERENCE (-5)

8th Grade

FY19 (58) FY21 (47) DIFFERENCE (-11)

MATH

6th Grade

FY19 (69) FY21 (49) DIFFERENCE (-20)

7th Grade

FY19 (29) FY21 (20) DIFFERENCE (-9)

8th Grade

FY19 (63) FY21 (47) DIFFERENCE (-16)

SCIENCE

FY19 (60) FY21 (53) DIFFERENCE (-7)

CIVICS

FY19 (78) FY21 (71) DIFFERENCE (-7)

ALGEBRA

FY19 (95) FY21 (68) DIFFERENCE (-27)

GEOMETRY

FY19 (98) FY21 (88) DIFFERENCE (-10)

Based on the data trend our focus will be to diminish course failure and increase learning gains and achievement. Our data trends show that a focus on mathematics and literacy that includes remediation of standards, foundational skills, while scaffolding instruction that meets the full intent

and rigor of standards in all content areas. We will specifically focus on our ESSA identified subgroup; SWD students: who will receive extra support by incorporating the co-teach model within all content areas. Through a variety of ways, including technology, small group, data chats, and student monitoring. If we are unsuccessful in addressing skill deficits and standard acquisition, then students will not pass their graduation-required assessments and not graduate from high school in a timely manner.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Two potential areas of concern are the proficiency of our SWD and ELL students in all content areas. Our focus is to diminish course failure and increase learning gains and achievement.

The FY19 FSA shows our SWD students' proficiency levels being the lowest of every subgroup.

English Language Arts (22)
Mathematics (29)
Science (25)

While the proficiency levels from FY21 Progress Monitoring Assessments, show an area of growth for ELL students in 6th and 7th grade in all content areas.

6th GRADE
English Language Arts (23.2)
Mathematics (13.4)

7th GRADE
English Language Arts (11.1)
Mathematics (3.9)
Civics (47.2)

Ensuring learning gains in Literacy and Mathematics and progress for ESSA categorized subgroups; we will analyze student data to identify which students fall under various subgroup categories. Students who fall within our ESSA subgroups are monitored for progress. They will receive additional support by utilizing the co-teach model to ensure lessons planned are based on the specific needs of the students.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

During FY20, educators' instructional capacity was challenged with hybrid instruction due to COVID. New and experienced teachers were tasked with learning technologies platforms; such as Google Classroom, Nearpod, and Google Suite. While learning how to balance in-person and virtual learning simultaneously. In addition, we had several teachers request leave of absence, leaving those positions either vacant and lacking certified teachers.

We experienced a lack of participation and engagement in classrooms. There was a significant increase in social-emotional behavior concerns across the board. We were concerned with the return of brick and mortar and especially our incoming 6th graders with transition, adjustment to routines, and their focus in class.

During FY20 and FY21, more than 50% of our students were virtual learners. Contact information was not accurate which caused a communication breakdown. Many of the educators were affected by

the pandemic, many were quarantined which caused interruptions in instruction and support services. All meetings; such as Parent-Teacher, Open House, and PLCs were virtual.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the FY19 FSA, our performance on Civics, Algebra, and Geometry EOCs was higher than the district and state. Civics increased their EOC performance from 74% in 2018 to 78% in 2019. Civics scored higher than the district by 6% in 2019. Algebra outperformed the district by 31% in 2019. Geometry outperformed the district by 38% in 2019.

While the FY21 Progress Monitoring Assessments, there was an increase in both English Language Arts and Mathematics in 6th grade. English Language Arts improved by 2% from Fall to Spring. Mathematics improved by 4% from Fall to Spring. In addition, Science improved by 7% from Fall to Spring.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our teachers focused on planning, additional support (before and after 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 students' 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 of 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; especially our SWD and ELL students.
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.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

1. Scheduling

Students on an accelerated path of learning that may have seen learning loss due to the hybrid school year will be supported through intensive Reading/ELA double block. As well as double block in Algebra and 7th grade Advanced Math.

2. PLC's

During PLCs, we will focus on developing effective and relevant instruction through unpacking standards, analyzing data, developing standards-based lessons using vetted resources and materials from the District, share best practices, following/participating with the coaching continuum model, incorporate research-based strategies including but not limited to GO-To Strategies, balanced literacy, small group instruction, and differentiated learning. Teachers will engage in common planning as well as lesson study to improve instructional capacity. Professional development

opportunities include district support/training, in-school coaching opportunities, and independent study.

3. Tutorials-Low 25% Learning Gains

If we focus on a positive impact on learning gains by ensuring standards-based instruction and effective use of research-based strategies and resources, we will ensure student learning and improved student achievement towards grade level success and ensure continuous improvement. Early identification of our Low 25% will allow for ample tracking and support to ensure their growth.

4. Attendance

Our focus is to increase student engagement so students become active learners in their own academic journey as they learn by doing and putting strategies into practice. It is our hope that students take ownership and foster independence through their engagement in their daily lessons. This focus will be ongoing and PD will be provided during staff meetings and on professional development days.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Development/Professional Learning Communities: Teachers will engage in deep, focused professional development, collaborative planning, and data analysis to strengthen standards-based instructional practices to accelerate student learning in ELA, Mathematics, and Science, particularly within the ESSA subgroups achieving below the Federal Index. PLCs continue to be an active part of our school schedule; they receive embedded PD.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

1. Small Group Differentiated Instruction

Targeted small group instruction using rigorous texts designed to increase learning gains in ELA and Mathematics. Data-driven differentiated instruction is planned to meet the needs of all students. Ongoing progress monitoring for all students. However, students who fall within our ESSA Subgroups will be specifically monitored for progress and receive additional support by the co-teach model to ensure instruction support to students' specific needs.

2. Literacy Across All Content Areas

Effective literacy skills, such as RACE and Marking the Text, enable students to analyze and think about content leading to a better understanding of concepts. During common planning and PLCs, teachers will plan the implementation of ELA standards as they plan instruction in all content areas.

3. Collaborative Planning with Academic Coaches and our Single School Culture Coordinator

Collaborative planning will consist of deliberate coaching, modeling, and guiding instructional expectations. The instructional expectations include data-driven instruction that scaffolds according to the needs of students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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).

**Area of
Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

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.

By FY22, we will improve to the following levels of proficiency

**Measurable
Outcome:** ELA 67%
Civics 82%
Math 75%
Science 69%

Monitoring: We will be monitoring the desired outcome by focusing on USAs and FSQ data trends. In PLC meetings, we will discuss remediation for any standard needing additional support. As well as the Winter Diagnostic to give a clear understanding of what is needed for review before the FSA assessments.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:** Jenifer Kuras (jenifer.kuras@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. Utilization of the 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.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:** 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 an 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. As well as utilizing the RACE writing strategy and Marking the Text reading strategy, related to content area standards.

**Person
Responsible** Daniel Caplin (daniel.caplin@palmbeachschools.org)

Science - an increased focus on vertical planning to support the assessed grade level. As well as utilizing the RACE writing strategy and Marking the Text reading strategy, related to content area standards.

Person Responsible Dawn Hartman (dawn.hartman@palmbeachschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Sharese Gillard (sharese.gillard@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

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 FY20 FSA, the greatest decline from the previous year was in overall performance in 6th grade math, where our school dropped 20% from FY19.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The data components which show the decline are:

MATH

6th Grade

FY19 (69) FY21 (49) DIFFERENCE (-20)

7th Grade

FY19 (29) FY21 (20) DIFFERENCE (-9)

8th Grade

FY19 (63) FY21 (47) DIFFERENCE (-16)

Measurable Outcome:

By FY21, Woodlands Middle School students in the lowest quartile for math will increase their overall proficiency of the Math FSA including Alegbra and Gemoetry by 5%.

Monitoring:

We will be monitoring the desired outcome by focusing on USAs and FSQ data trends. In PLC meetings, we will discuss remediation for any standard needing additional support. As well as the Winter Diagnostic to give a clear understanding of what is needed for review before the FSA assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenifer Kuras (jenifer.kuras@palmbeachschools.org)

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.

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Incorporate small groups instruction to support students learning
2. Math Teachers will use Math Nation 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.

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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

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)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | There is a gap in ELA proficiency between SWDs and their non-disabled counterparts. |
| Description and Rationale: | 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 7% increase in proficiency in our SWD subgroup in ELA. |
| Monitoring: | We will be monitoring the desired outcome by focusing on USAs and FSQ data trends. In PLC meetings, we will discuss remediation for any standard needing additional support. As well as the Winter Diagnostic to give a clear understanding of what is needed for review before the FSA assessments. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Jenifer Kuras (jenifer.kuras@palmbeachschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporate small groups and aggressively monitoring students will identify areas of 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 Jenifer Kuras (jenifer.kuras@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

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When looking at SafeSchoolsforAlex.org we see our school ranks 272 out of 553, Moderate when compared to all middle/junior schools statewide. We reported 3.2 incidents per 100 students. This rating was for a total enrollment of 1,529, with 49 incidents for the 2019-2020 school year. When looking at the ranking details the incidents rated Moderate is violent incidents. Our issues fall under Fighting, Bullying, and Harassment with 35 incidents. We had zero property incidents and ranked Moderate for Drug/Public Order incidents 233/553 for the State and 13/36 for the County. The incidents we ranked for are Tobacco, Disruption on Campus, and Drug Use or Possession, except Alcohol. Our total reported suspension ranked moderate. We had 78 in-school suspensions and 129 out-of-school suspensions in 2019-2020. To support our students and make an impact on incidents we will integrate a Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines and communicating these expectations to parents via the student handbook, and monitoring PBS through data, lessons, and resources.

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.

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous tasks 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 (6th-8th Social Studies & SEL Mustang Meetings)
- The History of Black and African Americans (6th- 8th Social Studies & SEL Mustang Meetings)
- The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics (6th- 8th Social Studies, SEL Mustang Meetings, and LIA)
- The Contributions of Women (6th- 8th Social Studies & SEL Mustang Meetings)
- 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, with 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 the 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.

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 is 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 are critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building 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 in Woodlands Middle School's Mission Statement. Promoting shared decision-making and soliciting feedback from teachers, students, families, and stakeholders is 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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

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 classes 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.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |