Westpointe Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Westpointe Elementary

7525 WESTPOINTE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32835

https://westpointees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Atresa Grubbs Holmes

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	77%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: No Grade
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

Westpointe Elementary

7525 WESTPOINTE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32835

https://westpointees.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 KG-5	No	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	80%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	A

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
Grubbs-Holmes, Atresa	Principal	Dr. Grubbs provides guidance for the school for the use of standards-based instruction and data driven decisions and ensures that the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process with fidelity. She monitors the leadership team and ensures that all aspects of the school functions are running efficiently and effectively. Through her leadership, the team is able to make decisions about students to determine and implement best practices based on students' needs. Furthermore, Dr. Grubbs makes sure that the team is implementing common planning effectively. She provides professional development opportunities at Westpointe Elementary as well as at other Orange County Public Schools locations. Dr. Grubbs, continuously works on improving standards-based instruction and classroom management by conducting daily classroom walk throughs and providing actionable feedback to staff to improve instructional best practices.
Shaw, Susan	Assistant Principal	Ms. Shaw assists the principal in the implementation of the common vision and ensures that the staff is implementing standards-based instruction by providing guidance and leadership to the staff. Through her leadership, the team is able to make informed decisions in implementing best practices. Ms. Shaw facilitates weekly core team meetings to review and discuss school data. She meets weekly to discuss the intensity of Tier 1 and Tier 2 intervention and enrichment to students as needed. She also supervises and evaluates personnel in terms of their performances and responsibilities to support the school-wide goals.
Smith, Carol	Instructional Coach	Ms. Smith oversees the implementation of the MTSS process at Westpointe. She works closely with the staffing coordinator, school psychologist and teachers by collecting and analyzing student data so that they can make informed decisions. She provides research-based intervention strategies and instruction. Ms. Smith participates in common planning, provides guidance in the reading curriculum, and collaborates with classroom teachers to deliver the appropriate interventions based on students' needs. Ms. Smith facilitates the MTSS process by meeting with the MTSS team to collaborate on student data to ensure the tiered system of intervention and support is being implemented with fidelity. Ms. Smith monitors the implementation on interventions through classroom observations, team meetings and data chats. She provides professional development on the MTSS process for the entire staff including the staffing specialist.
Pagan, Agnes	Instructional Coach	As the ESOL Curriculum Compliance Teacher (CCT) Ms. Pagan's responsibilities include coordinating with school staff and the district compliance specialist to monitor programs and services to students classified as English Language Learners (ELL). She completes documentation for ELL compliance. Ms. Pagan provides research-based recommendations, intervention and instruction to ELL teachers.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vaughn, Shaniece	Instructional Coach	Ms. Vaughn is responsible for keeping K-5 staff up-to date with Florida Standards along with the Curriculum Resource (CRM's). She assist the classroom teachers with the development of formative assessments, analyzes mini, unit and formative assessments, and facilitates PLC meetings including lesson planning while adhering to the scope and sequence. Ms. Vaughn provides professional development throughout the school year, target resources, and facilitate district and state assessment.
Oakley, Deborah	Instructional Coach	Ms. Oakley provides instructional coaching and support fourth and fifth grade teachers with science instruction in the science lab. Her responsibilities include analyzing mini and unit formative assessments and facilitating PLC. She provides instruction to teachers and students daily on the science standards, in the science lab and in classrooms.
Mauvais, Jeanine	Instructional Coach	Ms. Mauvais coordinates with Westpointe staff, district staffing specialist, itinerant teachers, evaluators, service providers, families and parent representatives, to convene Individual Educational Plans (IEP), MTSS Tier 3 Educational Planning Team, matrix and audits. She schedules and facilitates 504 meetings with the school psychologists and the MTSS coach to identify specific student needs. Ms. Mauvais assists with the development of IEP's for students, conducts initial gifted screenings, develop health plans, and coordinates social worker referrals. She provides social skills lessons and ensures that students receive mental support as needed. She is also the threat Assessment lead and the DCF contact.
Wesolowski, Rebecca	Instructional Media	Ms. Wesolowsi provide support to staff and students on the District Curriculum Technology Learning. She conducts property inventory and coordinates the wellness program. Ms. Wesolowsi coordinates the Battle of The Books and Girls On The Run program. She is the Sky Cap alternative for Westpointe Elementary.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/12/2019, Atresa Grubbs Holmes

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.*
3

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

544

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

1

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

0

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	11	92	110	129	99	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559
Attendance below 90 percent	4	19	24	23	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	8	33	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	6	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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

Monday 7/26/2021

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	5	119	124	115	119	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	1	26	29	14	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	14	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	10	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	5	119	124	115	119	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	1	26	29	14	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	14	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	10	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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				67%	57%	57%	59%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	58%	58%	61%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	53%	65%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	63%	63%	67%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	61%	62%	68%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	48%	51%	74%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	56%	53%	46%	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	53%	55%	-2%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	63%	-3%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	57%	3%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%
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 Reading Diagnostic Assessment
i-Ready Math Diagnostic Assessment
5th Grade Science Progress Monitoring Assessment

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15/15%	26/25%	37/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/15%	18/28%	21/32%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	8/15%	14/25%	21/36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21/21%	27/25%	34/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/21%	16/25%	18/28%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	14/25%	16/29%	21/36%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/19%	33/31%	50/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/22%	26/35%	34/47%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	4/7%	11/18%	24/39%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/5%	29/27%	44/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/6%	22/30%	33/46%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	2/3%	10/16%	20/33%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23/21%	38/33%	53/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/18%	22/32%	32/48%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	7/13%	16/30%	22/42%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/1%	10/9%	32/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/2%	6/9%	17/25%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	5/9%	15/28%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24/21%	36/31%	41/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/17%	22/29%	24/32%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	8/14%	14/23%	18/30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/3%	18/15%	41/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/4%	10/13%	24/32%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	2/3%	11/18%	20/33%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24/22%	24/21%	37/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/20%	13/19%	21/31%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	9/16%	8/14%	18/31%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12/11%	35/31%	45/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/7%	20/28%	28/42%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	7/12%	15/25%	21/36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	67/61%	63/56%	66/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/55%	34/52%	38/58%
	Students With Disabilities	1/50%	1/50%	1/50%
	English Language Learners	25/48%	22/42%	25/49%

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	8			31							
ELL	59	65	81	63	75	83	57				
BLK	50	63		48	32		52				
HSP	61	70	85	63	72	93	57				
WHT	61	40		65	67		71				
FRL	55	62	80	56	60	67	56				
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	15			15							
ELL	60	72	66	74	57	36	45				
ASN	83			83							
BLK	57	41		69	49		55				
HSP	64	70	58	66	50	36	49				
WHT	83	70		83	67		69				
FRL	64	66	55	66	52	35	46				
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	18	36		28	38						
ELL	42	64	71	61	76	83	22				
ASN	86	80		93	90						
BLK	54	50		59	63	64	26				
HSP	54	63	68	64	71	81	45				
WHT	65	65		80	63		59				
FRL	57	58	58	66	67	66	48				

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	70
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	49
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	72
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	63
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	63
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?

Based on data from the i-Ready Reading assessments, 2nd and 3rd grades showed the highest learning gains overall (29% and 26% respectively) and in ELL (32% and 29%) and Economically Disadvantaged (25% and 30%) sub-groups.

Proficiency percentages were lower on i-Ready Reading overall in 3rd grade (47%) than on the 2021 FSA ELA (57%).

i-Ready Math assessments were our lowest data component in first through fourth grades. Fifth grade improved 30% with an overall proficiency of 41%.

Students with Disabilities were the lowest performing sub-group on both i-Ready Reading and i-Ready Math with 0% proficiency at the BOY and EOY assessments.

In Science, 5th graders did not see much movement and remained within 3% in all sub-group proficiencies throughout the year. However, this was the highest proficiency percentage of all three core content areas.

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

According to the 2019 FSA data, the component that showed the lowest performance would be the Math Lowest Quartile. This declined from the prior year (from 74% in 2018 to 37% in 2019).

Furthermore, progress monitoring data showed Students with Disabilities as the lowest performing sub group on both i-Ready Reading and Math Diagnostic Assessments.

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

One factor that contributed to the decline is the inconsistency with providing small group differentiated instruction in order to provide support to meet individual students' needs. Flexible, differentiated groupings based on individual needs will be initiated to support low performing students. Intensive tiered intervention will also be provided to the lowest 25% of students.

Another factor that possibly contributed to the performance decline, is a decreased attendance rate. The attendance below 90% rate increased 4% from the previous year to 19%. This could be due to a lack of student engagement.

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

On i-Ready Reading Assessments, 2nd and 3rd grade demonstrated learning gains for all students (29% and 26%, respectively) between the BOY and EOY. ELL sub-groups on the same grade levels also saw gains of 32% and 29%. Economically Disadvantaged sub-groups had gains of 25% and 23% for the same grade levels. This correlates with an increase on the FSA ELA scores for third grade of 4% from 2019 to 2021.

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

Increased monitoring of student data through weekly PLC meetings contributed to the improvement in overall scores. Data was monitored more frequently which allowed for better informed instruction. Re-teaching of skills was more timely and reinforced through additional practice.

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

In order to accelerate learning, flexible differentiated groupings will be created in each classroom using relevant, timely data. Teachers will be monitored for consistent use of small groups and data will be reviewed bi-weekly by grade levels.
In addition, targeted intervention groups in ELA and Math will be utilized to differentiate skills and strategies provided to students. Intensive tiered intervention will be provided to the lowest 25%. Student engagement will be addressed by introducing strategies to teachers during professional development.

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 will be led by Curriculum Associates i-Ready staff to develop knowledge of data that will create differentiated small groups within classes and within grade levels for targeted intervention.

Teachers will have the opportunity to participate in a book study of The Wild Card by Hope and Wade King. This book focuses on student engagement through creative instructional strategies that can be incorporated into classroom lessons.
Teachers in grades 3rd, 4th, and 5th will also participate in professional development provided by Sarah McCarthy of McCarthy Math Academy.

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

The principal will facilitate data meetings and support teachers through planning days to analyze data to create small groups to differentiate instruction in Math. Students in the lowest 25% have been identified and targeted; tiered intervention is in place to ensure these students are kept in very small groups to accelerate learning.

The MTSS Coach will monitor school-wide tiered interventions. She will assist teachers with identifying deficit skills to target for intervention and provide resources to conduct the tiered instruction.

The Social Worker will be monitoring high absenteeism and tardies and provide support to families as needed. Families will be connected with appropriate resources.

The Curriculum Compliance Teacher will work with teachers to use strategies that support ELL learners.

The Staffing Specialist/LEA will monitor compliance of accommodations on our campus. She will work with teachers to provide training and assistance in the use of Universal Design for Learning strategies in planning for instruction to support our SWD in math.

The leadership team will work on promoting a positive school culture through the CHAMPS Behavior Management Approach for all students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a social and emotional learning culture to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: On the i-Ready EOY for ELA, 59% of the students were on grade level, 23% were one grade level below, and 17% were two or more grade levels below, which was an increase of 20 pts. from BOY of students on grade level. On the i-Ready EOY for Math, 62% of the students were on grade level, 28% were one grade level below, and 9% were two or more grade levels below, which is an increase of 21% pts. from BOY of students on grade level. Overall, math was higher than reading, and 3rd-grade EOY ELA was higher than 4th and 5th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcomes are as follow: 1) Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data- At least 80% decrease in absenteeism and tardiness as measured by Skyward attendance 2) Anticipated impact of culture and climate on student achievement- As a result of participating in the school-wide culture and climate activities, at least 90% of our students in 3rd through 5th grade will show learning gains in math as measured by FSA in spring 2022. 3) Cognia survey data - At least 85% of students who participate in the Cognia Survey will indicate effective or highly effective on Culture and Environment as it relates to Social-Emotional.
Monitoring:	We will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Atresa Grubbs-Holmes (atresa.grubbs-holmes@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Westpointe Elementary will plan and implement two professional learning cycles to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs. We are also participating in the district's Social Emotional Learning and Leadership Initiative.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities in the school.
Action Steps to Implement	

Provide SEL professional development to build and establish a school culture for social and emotional learning with adults and students by implementing strategies and resources.

Person Responsible	Atresa Grubbs-Holmes (atresa.grubbs-holmes@ocps.net)

Provide ongoing professional development for staff to support team dynamics and collaboration. Ensure the transfer from professional development to practice by providing coaching support to teachers on specific SEL strategies and intentional planning during PLC.

Person Responsible	Jeanine Mauvais (jeanine.mauvais@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will develop and implement flexible grouping, including small group instruction based on students' needs. Only 21% of our Students With Disabilities (SWD) scored 3 or above on the FSA ELA in 2019. Furthermore, when comparing the 2020-2021 iReady Diagnostic data on the EOY for ELA, 22% of the students were on grade level, 44% were one grade level below, and 35% were two or more grade levels below. On the EOY for Math, 38% of the students were on grade level, 46% were one grade level below, and 14% were two or more grade levels below.
Measurable Outcome:	For our SWD, we expect an increase in student achievement on 2022 FSA ELA from 21% to 41%.
Monitoring:	We will target individual student achievement gaps to ensure the needs of all students are being met.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Atresa Grubbs-Holmes (atresa.grubbs-holmes@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 90 minute Reading block, we will implement small group differentiated instruction using the acceleration model. Classroom observations and student assessment data, including i-Ready, will be used to determine the effectiveness of this strategy. During FBS, students will be pulled out to focus on specific strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Grouping students to focus on their specific standards deficiency will help teachers work with students in their area of need. Teachers will assign students to homogeneous and heterogeneous groups based on explicit learning goals, monitor peer interactions, and provide positive and corrective feedback to support productive learning. Teachers will use small learning groups to accommodate learning differences, promote in-depth academic-related interactions and teach students to work collaboratively.

Action Steps to Implement

The administration and coaches will provide ongoing collaborative discussions focused on culturally relevant learning, scaffolded support for students with disabilities, and IEP reviews to ensure that the goals are aligned to grade-level standards. Share the BPIE indicators and results during PLC's to help teachers understand our students' needs.

Person Responsible	Carol Smith (carol.smith@ocps.net)

We will monitor differentiated instruction during classroom observations and provide actionable feedback as well as monitor the data through data chats.

Person Responsible	Atresa Grubbs-Holmes (atresa.grubbs-holmes@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Westpointe Elementary is ranked #195 with a Very Low rating. The reported incidents rating is 0.1 per 100 students. In 2019, the last year of reporting, there were no in-school or out-of-school suspensions. The rates for property incidents and drug/public order incidents were both at 0. Violent Incidents were rated at 0.14 per 100 students. Hitting/shoving will be our primary area of concern. We use the Champs Behavior Management system school-wide. This incorporates expected behaviors for every area of the school. Students will be monitored as they move through the hallway, attend special areas and lunch, as well as in their classrooms. Students will participate in the Second Step Social and Emotional Training in classrooms. Teachers will also integrate social and emotional learning skills within the classroom. Discipline data will be utilized to monitor the effectiveness of Champs.

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.

To establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning and leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive social and emotional learning culture and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders through processes such as the School Advisory Council to reflect on implementation and determination the next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy.

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

At Westpointe, all stakeholders, staff, students, parents, and the community, have a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Our staff engages with students through social-emotional learning as well as wellness activities. Our School Social Worker works with students and staff throughout the campus. She leads small groups, wellness activities and works with the community in a monthly wellness newsletter. The staff works with parents outside of the classroom at school events and through community partnerships.