

Broward County Public Schools

Westwood Heights Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Westwood Heights Elementary School

2861 SW 9TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Georgia Stewart

Start Date for this Principal: 2/4/2020

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* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Broward 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Westwood Heights Elementary School

2861 SW 9TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

[no web address on file]

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	82%
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	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Our school's mission is to increase student achievement and close the achievement gap.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Westwood Heights Elementary is to provide an environment that fosters personal growth through self awareness and self management while engaging in learning focused on real-world experiences designed to close the achievement gap.

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
Stewart, Georgia	Principal	The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system.
Valme, Josianne	Assistant Principal	Handle student disciplinary issues, they also deal with other school management issues, including Curriculum instruction, Student services and activities, and Personnel management.
Kersher, Madison	Teacher, ESE	Responsible for providing support to schools to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or Access curriculum, statewide assessments, and accountability systems.
Wint, Mondelle	Reading Coach	The Coach will work directly with teachers in a school providing classroom-based demonstrations, collaborative and one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher inquiry and related professional development.
Hanslip, Rohan	Math Coach	Increase the mathematics achievement of elementary school students by building instructional capacity of classroom teachers; provide technical assistance and support to classroom teachers and principals in math instruction. Model lessons which include best instructional practices in math instruction for elementary school teachers, monitor classroom instruction, and coach teachers in best practices for math instruction including the implementation of manipulatives into instruction.
Rodriguez, Shevaun	Math Coach	Increase the mathematics achievement of elementary school students by building instructional capacity of classroom teachers; provide technical assistance and support to classroom teachers and principals in math instruction. Model lessons which include best instructional practices in math instruction for elementary school teachers, monitor classroom instruction, and coach teachers in best practices for math instruction including the implementation of manipulatives into instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 2/4/2020, Georgia Stewart

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

537

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

13

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

8

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	80	96	86	98	101	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	34	52	40	52	45	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	3	6	91	88	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273

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	1	3	4	51	40	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 6/28/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	80	96	86	98	101	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	34	52	40	52	45	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	29	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	3	4	51	40	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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				35%	59%	57%	34%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	60%	58%	58%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	54%	53%	63%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	65%	63%	53%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	66%	62%	66%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	53%	51%	69%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				33%	46%	53%	48%	49%	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	34%	60%	-26%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	34%	62%	-28%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	25%	59%	-34%	56%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	65%	-3%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	67%	-20%	64%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	64%	-24%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	31%	49%	-18%	53%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA iReady Diagnostics

Science Common Formative Assessments

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23.4%	29.5%	38.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.3%	30.4%	0
	Students With Disabilities	21.4%	24%	20%
	English Language Learners	15.5	13.3%	31.8%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17.7%	21.8%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.7%	24.6%	0
	Students With Disabilities	11.1%	25%	0
	English Language Learners	33.3%	20%	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30.7%	35.1%	17.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.3%	37.9%	18.8%
	Students With Disabilities	21.4%	20%	0
	English Language Learners	28.6%	35.1%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26.8%	27.4%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.7%	27.7%	0
	Students With Disabilities	15.4%	14.3%	0
	English Language Learners	13.3%	20%	0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27.6%	34.6%	27.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.5%	32.9%	24.6%
	Students With Disabilities	15.4%	21.4%	9.1%
	English Language Learners	22.2%	40%	9.1%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11.8%	18.5%	33.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.7%	17.8%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	8.3%	66.7%	7.1%
	English Language Learners	11.8%	18.5%	33.3%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16.9%	17.6%	23.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.6%	0	23.3%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	17.3%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12.8%	18.4%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	18.2%	0
	Students With Disabilities	7.1%	6.7	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18.4%	24.3%	13.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.2%	18.5%	7.1%
	Students With Disabilities	14.3%	15.4%	12.5%
	English Language Learners	11.1%	11.1%	14.3%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17.1%	22.7%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.7%	21.2%	0
	Students With Disabilities	7.1%	7.7%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	15.8%	8.7%	15.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	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	36	46		34	38	36	32				
ELL	13	8		15			8				
BLK	29	33	25	19	18	25	23				
HSP	19	40		26	30		10				
FRL	24	31	19	16	17	29	18				
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	35	58		58	73		36				
ELL	37	66	62	61	61	64	23				
BLK	35	54	55	52	47	43	31				
HSP	28	63		60	47						
FRL	35	56	60	53	49	41	33				
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	42	56	60	52	48	40	47				
ELL	23	67	80	53	60						
BLK	33	56	60	52	66	68	47				
HSP	35	75		50	55						
FRL	33	58	63	53	66	69	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	26
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	26
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	207
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	12
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	25
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	25
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	21
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?

Thirty-five percent of students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher on the 2019 FSA ELA.

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

Based on the 2019 state assessments, overall ELA achievement demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

To improve ELA achievement, the school must take the following targeted actions: engage learners in rigorous on-grade level reading instruction, use data to drive instruction and remediation, and utilize common formative assessments to measure student progress.

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

Grade 3 iReady Math showed the most improvement. On Diagnostic #1, 11.8% achieved proficiency. Diagnostic #3 results indicate 33.3% of students in grade achieved proficiency for an increase of 21.5%.

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

Grade 3 classes used the departmentalization model. Students utilized the iReady platform with fidelity. Teachers utilized common formative assessments to monitor progress and utilized the data to plan, remediate and reteach. Resources such as Reflex Math helped build fluency, and teachers received ongoing coaching and support.

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

In addition to Tier 1 instruction, students will receive double-dose instruction in reading and math delivered by highly-qualified teachers.

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.

Teachers participate in bi-weekly professional learning community (PLC) meetings designed to target areas based on student formative assessment data.

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

Classes utilize the self-contained model; ILT (instructional leadership team) conduct weekly rigor walks followed by constructive feedback; students will participate in extended learning opportunities for further remediation and enrichment; Additional ESSER teachers provide intensive intervention in ELA and math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the analysis of the 2021 FSA scores, it is evident that 65% of our scholars continue to score below proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, 50% of students in grade 3-5 will achieve a level 3 or higher on the ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored through formative assessments, data chats, and PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mondelle Wint (mondelle.wint@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing a written response strategy with text evidence based and text dependent strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The purpose for using a written response strategy for responding to texts is to build scholars' comprehension level, organize their thoughts, using text evidence to support their reasonings, and assist them in elaborating their written responses.

Action Steps to Implement

To address the Area of Focus,

- *Analysis of most current data
- *Coaches and Team Leaders will conduct PLCs based on data
- *Teachers and Coaches will attend weekly grade level common planning
- * Attend District trainings
- *Coaches monitor and provide appropriate support

Person Responsible Mondelle Wint (mondelle.wint@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the analysis of the 2021 FSA scores, it is evident more than 60% of our scholars continue to score below proficiency.
---	--

Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, 50% of students in grade 3-5 will achieve a level 3 or higher on the Math FSA.
----------------------------	---

Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored through formative assessments, data chats, and PLCs.
--------------------	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
---	---------------------

Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing a research based word problem solving strategies, CUBES.
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategy will provide students with step-by-step actionable steps to pick apart, identify key terms, and understand what is being asked in a story problem.
---	---

Action Steps to Implement

To address the Area of Focus,

*Analysis of most current data

*Coaches and Team Leaders will conduct PLCs based on data

*Teachers and Coaches will attend weekly grade level common planning

* Attend District trainings

*Coaches monitor and provide appropriate support

Person Responsible	Shevaun Rodriguez (shevaun.rodriguez@browardschools.com)
---------------------------	--

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.

Westwood Heights ranked #1,080 out of 1,395 statewide and #111 out of 126 schools in our county. Fighting and Battery are the 2 areas of concern. Based on the data, we have our Schoolwide Positive Behavior Plan (PBIS). It is implemented with fidelity throughout the year. The PBIS team will meet quarterly to review data and make recommendations for interventions and support. We have implementation of a reward system in the cafeteria, specials, classrooms, and playgrounds. Character Education, Counseling, and Conflict Mediation are implemented by the school counselor and social worker.

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.

Westwood Heights Elementary operates with the collaboration of multiple stakeholder groups by seeking their input and feedback. The school's vision is used as a guide to plan and develop a plan to meet the needs of all learners.

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

Stakeholders play an integral role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school. Committees like the School Advisory Council (SAC), School Advisory Forum (SAF) and the Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) ensure the community is continuously engaged in activities designed to enhance learning and close the achievement gap for all learners. Our community liaison, school social worker and school counselor collaborate to provide a wide range of services designed to nurture a culture of academic achievement and student success.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0631 - Westwood Heights Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional materials to supplement web-based iReady Learning.</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0631 - Westwood Heights Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Ready LAFS - Test preparation consumables</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0631 - Westwood Heights Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: iReady Toolbox - Instructional Materials to supplement web-based iReady learning.</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0631 - Westwood Heights Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Ready MAFS - Test preparation consumables to supplement iReady instruction.</i>			
	6300	500-Materials and Supplies	0631 - Westwood Heights Elementary	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Whiteboards and manipulatives to support math instruction.</i>			
Total:						\$0.00