

Orange County Public Schools

West Oaks Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Oaks Elementary

905 DORSCHER RD, Orlando, FL 32818

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

Demographics

Principal: Elaine Lundberg

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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 Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Oaks Elementary

905 DORSCHER RD, Orlando, FL 32818

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Durant, Rojina	Principal	<p>Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, provides clear direction by establishing measurable goals and establishes a positive school culture. Mrs. Durant ensures that the school-based teams are implementing research-based instructional strategies focused on the work of improving academic achievement. Mrs. Thompson monitors the use of common assessments and ensures data is analyzed, interpreted, and used to drive classroom instruction. Mrs. Durant establishes instructional teams who collaborate regularly, provides professional development opportunities addressing school improvement focus areas and provides support through the use of instructional coaches and modeling. Ms. Durant also allows for opportunities for students, parents, staff, and the community to provide input regarding the function of the school and engages families in a variety of learning and relationship-building activities throughout the school year.</p>
Calvin, Keenya	Assistant Principal	<p>Develops documents necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data analysis, management and implementation to drive instruction. Provides guidance on the K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of tier 1, 2 and 3 intervention plans. Monitors, provides actionable feedback, and ensures accountability of the MAO initiatives and Culturally Responsive School Plan.</p>
Oladosu, Naquisha	Instructional Coach	<p>Ms. Oladosu, the instructional coach works collaboratively with the school-based problem-solving teams to develop and implement training, coach and support teachers, and participate in collaborative planning. Ms. Oladosu also serves as the reading coach to facilitate the management and interpretation of data necessary to develop, implement and evaluate reading and writing instruction across the grade levels. Ms. Oladosu also coordinates our mentee and mentor program for teachers with less than three years of experience or those new to our school assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered at risk;</p>
Garcia, Susan	Reading Coach	<p>Ms. Garcia, works collaboratively with the school-based problem-solving teams to develop and implement training, coach and support teachers, and participate in collaborative planning for ELA. Ms. Garcia serves as to facilitate the management and interpretation of data necessary to develop, implement and evaluate reading and writing instruction across the grade levels.</p>
Chandler, Alma	Math Coach	<p>Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; Identifies systematic patterns of students' need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, Instructional evidence-based intervention strategies; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring,</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; uses data to adjust the needs of students with tier 1, 2, and 2 instruction in math</p>
Murray, Regina	Math Coach	<p>Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; Identifies systematic patterns of students' need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, Instructional evidence-based intervention strategies; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; uses data to adjust the needs of students with tier 1, 2, and 2 instruction in math</p>
Karimi, Aki	Staffing Specialist	<p>The staffing specialists, Ms. Karimi, facilitates and provides training to school staff regarding ESE procedures, least restrictive environment, and other items related to students with disabilities. Ms. Karimi serves as a liaison and expert on school board, state and federal laws related to special education services. Assists in the development and implementation of student IEPs to ensure accuracy and appropriate services and accommodations are provided. Participates in student data collection integrates core instructional activities/materials into tier 3 instruction and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.</p>
Downey, Mary	Science Coach	<p>Serves as the science coach to facilitate the management and interpretation of data necessary to develop, implement and evaluate science instruction across the grade levels.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/9/2021, Elaine Lundberg

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.*

0

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

496

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

5

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

4

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	33	78	78	104	65	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	462
Attendance below 90 percent	11	28	13	25	11	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	7	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	7	4	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/17/2021

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	36	84	89	89	108	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	1	11	14	8	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	1	24	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	3	35	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	36	84	89	89	108	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	1	11	14	8	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	1	24	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	

Students with two or more indicators 0 0 1 3 35 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 59

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1

Students retained two or more times 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1

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				45%	57%	57%	46%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	58%	58%	61%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	52%	53%	52%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	63%	63%	45%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	61%	62%	48%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	48%	51%	44%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				59%	56%	53%	45%	55%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	57%	-21%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	37%	63%	-26%	64%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready - Kindergarten - Fifth Grade ELA and Math
 Progress Monitoring Assessment (PMA) - Fifth Grade Science

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	42	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	42	57
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	8
	English Language Learners	34	32	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	27	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	27	53
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	11	16	37

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	44	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	44	57
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	7
	English Language Learners	20	35	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	19	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	19	39
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	5
	English Language Learners	5	15	29

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	46	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	46	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	3
	English Language Learners	24	46	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	15	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	15	37
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	12	22

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	25	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	25	32
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	20	23	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	22	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	22	34
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	8	22	47
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	28	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	28	45
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	29	38	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	25	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	25	47
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	15	17	45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	51	42	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	42	47
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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		16	17	5	32	30	8				
ELL	34	59		27	52		27				
BLK	31	40	32	30	37	41	35				
HSP	36	62		23	23		62				
FRL	30	36	38	29	36	41	33				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	48	63	11	31	35					
ELL	39	43	56	39	58	64	56				
BLK	43	52	68	46	48	48	57				
HSP	52	50		45	50						
FRL	41	50	61	45	48	50	62				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	7	31	31	4	27	40					
ELL	40	70	63	40	56	54	29				
BLK	45	58	47	45	46	42	45				
HSP	48	83		38	67						
FRL	46	61	50	44	50	47	46				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
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	40
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

The students have achieved approximately the same level of proficiency in ELA and math. As students move from third to fifth, their proficiency in ELA and math also continues to grow. The ESE subgroup continues to achieve minimal growth and plateau around second grade.

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

Our students with disabilities made little or no gains towards proficiency or measurable learning gains.

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

The use of small group instruction, peer interaction, and ability grouping students based upon learning gaps was limited. Also, in self-contained classes there was limited scaffolding to support students with on grade-level instruction. The certified ESE and non-certified ESE teachers should receive professional development on how to scaffold grade level standard instruction and support ESE students using the accommodations on their IEPs appropriately.

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

Students in the lowest quartile for ELA showed the most improvement. The improvement was more than 10% higher than the district or state growth.

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

A new intervention program was introduced school-wide, which provided targeted instruction to students based upon an initial placement assessment. Every adult in the building was given a small group of students with which to provide the intervention and enrichment support in reading.

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

The acceleration program will continue to be used with fidelity, groups need to remain small, and adjustments to group placement will need to be made so students can grow and move at their own paces. Additional adults in the building will also push in to classrooms to support the tier one instruction as well as students with IEPs.

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.

Our professional development will reflect how to differentiate instruction during small groups, how to use resources effectively, and how to respond to data fluidly.

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

The campus has an additional tutor and four Tier 1 teachers. There will be after school tutoring in ELA and an additional intervention program will be introduced for our lowest achieving students who have a need for accelerated phonics instruction. Every adult on campus will have a small group of students in which they will work on filling the reading gaps of students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2019, 13.1% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA which was an increase from 7.4% in 2018. The rationale for focusing on this subgroup is to continue the upward movement of proficiency growth.

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency achievement will increase 10% among students with disabilities in grades 3-5.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through performance on the common assessments and i-Ready. Walkthroughs will be conducted by administrators and academic coaches to monitor instruction and correct usage of materials. Data meetings will occur monthly to track student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rojina Durant (rojina.durant@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Develop and implement fluid groups for intervention and small group instruction with multiple adults on campus as instructors following a specified schedule

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Allowing students opportunities to be taught in small groups by different adults and instructional materials is expected to provide more individualized instruction and attention to their academic needs in foundational skills as well as comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

Assess students, determine learning gaps, and then create leveled groupings. Revisit data throughout the year and group students accordingly.

Person Responsible Naquisha Oladosu (naquisha.oladosu@ocps.net)

Monitor implementation of intervention lessons through classroom observations. Provide teachers with actionable feedback.

Person Responsible Rojina Durant (rojina.durant@ocps.net)

Monitor data on common assessments and i-Ready. Hold data chats with teachers and students to communicate expectations for support, set goals, and celebrate success.

Person Responsible Susan Garcia (susan.garcia@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus According to the Panaroma data of Spring 2021, only 52% of adults on campus feel connected to other adults on campus and only 64% of them feel as if they matter on campus.

Description and Rationale: Panorama data from students in grades 3-5 revealed that they believe 76% of students are disrespectful often to each other.
A sense of belonging and respect amongst adults and students is needed in order to make individuals on campus feel valued and respected.

Measurable Outcome: By Spring of 2022, adults feeling connected to other adults and feeling like they matter on campus as well as students demonstrating respect will increase by 10% each.

Monitoring: Voluntary participation in team building activities, weekly and monthly celebrations for students and adults, as well as a decrease in referrals be monitored.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rojina Durant (rojina.durant@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement continuous improvement plan for social emotional learning focused on implementing school-wide SEL curriculum. Modeling and implementing SEL strategies will increase student and adult ability to regulate emotions, develop a sense of belonging, and increase self esteem and motivation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This will build a sense of community that builds caring, positive, and responsible relationships on campus.

Action Steps to Implement

Assign a leadership team member to lead SEL PD along with the other members of the SEL team.

Person Responsible Rojina Durant (rojina.durant@ocps.net)

Schedule monthly team building events for adults and create a system for teachers to recognize their peers on campus for exemplary demonstration of teamwork.

Person Responsible Keenya Calvin (keenya.calvin@ocps.net)

Hold SEL activities during health for intermediate students and small group guidance sessions with most challenging students on campus.

Person Responsible Aldo Chamblin (aldo.chamblin@ocps.net)

Bi-weekly student celebrations for demonstrating the character traits of the month and other signs of respect during peer to peer interactions.

Person Responsible Alma Chandler (alma.chandler@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: On the most recent FSA, data indicated that 68% of students scored below Level 3 in the English Language Arts (ELA).

Measurable Outcome: The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 30 percentage points from 32% to 55%.

Monitoring: The i-Ready diagnostic, SIPPS Mastery Assessments, classroom walkthroughs, district standards based assessments, K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments and Heggerty Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice strong level of evidence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This selected instructional practice(s) have a strong level of evidence. The strategy was chosen because the school has a deficit in the phonological awareness and phonics needs of the students K-5. The strategy supports the acquisition of letter sound knowledge, segmentation, morphology, and high frequency words. Evidence-based programs such as SIPPS and Heggerty Phonological Phonemic Awareness have a proven record of effectiveness for the the target population.

Action Steps to Implement

Strengthen the common planning process including K-2 foundational planning K-2.

Person Responsible Rojina Durant (rojina.durant@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.

Person Responsible Rojina Durant (rojina.durant@ocps.net)

Ensure 90 minute reading block contains statutory requirements.

Person Responsible Keenya Calvin (keenya.calvin@ocps.net)

Standard Based Unit Assessments (SBUA) Data and Foundational Assessment Data is used to plan small group instruction and differentiation opportunities.

Person Responsible Naquisha Oladosu (naquisha.oladosu@ocps.net)

Provide targeted ELA PD based on teacher needs such as B.E.S.T. ELA Canvas course and ELA Impact.

Person Responsible Naquisha Oladosu (naquisha.oladosu@ocps.net)

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure students, are appropriate, identified and matched to appropriate interventions and intensity. Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to intervention based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team's findings.

Person Responsible Naquisha Oladosu (naquisha.oladosu@ocps.net)

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure students, are appropriate, identified and matched to appropriate interventions and intensity. Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to intervention based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team's findings.

Person Responsible Naquisha Oladosu (naquisha.oladosu@ocps.net)

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.

West Oaks ES ranked #1378 out of 1,395 elementary schools in the state. We reported 9.7 incidents per 100 students which has us fall into the very high category. Our primary incident of concern are violent incidents on campus where we rank 1,382 out of 1,395 incidents. In all other categories, we rank very low. The school culture will be examined to make sure the right adults are in the correct roles to facilitate school-wide change in behaviors of students. The environment will also need to change to address the expectations of students and the support for their emotional well being. Finally, the antecedent to the incidents to examine if behaviors are a manifestation of disability or are due to classroom environment/procedures.

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.

Engage in ongoing socio emotional district-wide professional development whole-school. Strengthen students' emotional development through celebrations and guidance services. Adults will use common language when addressing students' needs in discipline, teaching, and emotional support.

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

Administrators, leadership team, and members of SEL team, that includes the guidance counselor, will be the main individuals on campus ensuring timely professional development, social emotional celebrations on campus, and strategies for dealing with most challenging students on campus.