

Alachua County Public Schools

Westwood Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	0

Westwood Middle School

1262 NW 31ST DRIVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/westwood>

Demographics

Principal: Daniel Burney

Start Date for this Principal: 11/13/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Alachua County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Westwood Middle School

1262 NW 31ST DRIVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/westwood>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

Westwood Middle School creates an environment where all students are able to learn and achieve college and career readiness in a safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Westwood Middle School is a place where all students can learn to be college and career ready and achieve their potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/13/2017, Daniel Burney

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

856

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.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	283	295	333	0	0	0	0	911
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	53	0	0	0	0	164
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	18	23	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	76	115	0	0	0	0	240
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	96	103	0	0	0	0	255
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	60	73	0	0	0	0	177
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	73	75	0	0	0	0	202
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	76	107	134	0	0	0	0	317

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	5	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	21

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/14/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	296	331	322	0	0	0	0	949
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	34	40	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	32	30	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	38	19	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	11	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	83	72	0	0	0	0	220
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	82	62	0	0	0	0	219

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	92	68	0	0	0	0	227

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	13

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	296	331	322	0	0	0	0	949
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	34	40	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	32	30	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	38	19	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	11	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	83	72	0	0	0	0	220
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	82	62	0	0	0	0	219

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	92	68	0	0	0	0	227

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	13

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				55%	59%	54%	55%	60%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	56%	54%	55%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	41%	47%	35%	40%	47%
Math Achievement				57%	60%	58%	57%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains				52%	56%	57%	61%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	46%	51%	46%	45%	51%
Science Achievement				56%	53%	51%	54%	56%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				69%	73%	72%	64%	73%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	53%	53%	0%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	52%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2021					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	56%	59%	-3%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	21%	27%	-6%	46%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	48%	6%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	67%	69%	-2%	71%	-4%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	84%	56%	28%	61%	23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	48%	-48%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

District AIMS Test data for each class and grade was used.

For 6th and 7th Grade Math, the regular & Accelerated Test data were combined.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51.3	40.3	84.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.9	24.4	85.7
	Students With Disabilities	21.1	15.8	100
	English Language Learners	23.1	21.4	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53.8	45.7	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.2	33.0	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	26.7	12.5	N/A
	English Language Learners	22.2	46.7	N/A

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53.7	43.7	95.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.6	32.1	100
	Students With Disabilities	14.3	7.1	20
	English Language Learners	50	26.3	100
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.5	38.4	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.9	26.9	21.4
	Students With Disabilities	11.8	17.6	0
	English Language Learners	30.4	31.8	25
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47.4	37.9	13.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	34.7	28.6	10.5
	Students With Disabilities	0	21.1	0
	English Language Learners	26.3	21.7	10.5

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46.7	46.8	88.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.8	26.7	100
	Students With Disabilities	8.7	0	N/A
	English Language Learners	21.7	3.8	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9.1	5.5	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.0	5.2	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	13.6	5	N/A
	English Language Learners	7.1	0	N/A
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61.5	42.4	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.5	23.0	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	6.3	5.6	N/A
	English Language Learners	43.5	20.0	N/A

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	30	29	14	28	26	14	23			
ELL	27	63	62	24	42	46	11	53			
ASN	69	73		74	61		50	73	82		
BLK	27	39	37	17	28	34	20	37	45		
HSP	45	57	51	43	44	39	48	49	88		
MUL	62	61		54	45		41	70	62		
WHT	79	70	43	76	60	29	77	79	79		
FRL	34	44	40	26	30	32	19	44	45		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	40	39	17	34	30	15	45			
ELL	26	47	42	34	55	51	28	60	91		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	70	64		81	74		50				
BLK	32	39	35	33	37	31	33	44	77		
HSP	51	53	45	50	48	42	51	61	82		
MUL	51	57	42	61	59	60	45	76	79		
WHT	77	66	62	79	64	65	81	92	85		
FRL	39	44	36	39	43	37	40	56	74		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	11	32	29	17	41	39	3	16			
ELL	20	51	40	32	50	32	15	27			
ASN	68	75		76	80		91		77		
BLK	34	42	35	34	46	41	36	45	51		
HSP	43	51	32	41	51	35	41	57	59		
MUL	50	49	29	61	65	57	47	65	90		
WHT	78	69	39	81	78	67	73	85	87		
FRL	39	46	34	40	52	44	41	48	68		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	43
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	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
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	52
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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
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	38
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?

Students with disabilities and African American students need additional support to maximize their success. This can be observed in both ELA and Math test data.

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

Achievement for ELA, Math, and Science for our students with disabilities. This subgroup increased by 8 points in ELA and 12 points in science, but did not show a change for Math. The lowest quartile for this subgroup also decreased by 9 points from the previous year.

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

Some factors may include teachers' inexperience when working with SWDs, attendance, suspensions, distance learning (Digital Academy), and having a long-term sub in a general education classroom.

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

Our Social Studies Achievement had the greatest improvement with an overall increase of 8 points. All subgroups, with the exception of African American students (decreased by 1 point), increased by 4-33 points.

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

We created schedules so that teachers had one main subject focus (single prep, i.e. Civics only).

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

Implementation of reading remediation through iReady curriculum, both online and physical text. Further fluency support and remediation of reading through additional paraprofessional assistance.

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.

Support from Don Fitzpatrick for iReady curriculum. Data chats with district personnel and site administrators. Professional development centered around culturally responsive teaching - hopefully to reach lowest quartile learners.

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

Added personnel support in the area of literacy tutoring.

Ongoing progress monitoring - AIMS and quarterly data analysis from IXL and iReady.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Increasing gains of the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math
Description and Rationale:	We believe that the success of the bottom quartile students has direct implications on the success of our entire student population.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile on the FSA by 6 percent points.
Monitoring:	Quarterly Progress Monitoring Scores
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using iReady with our lower quartile students (explicit reading instruction). Using IXL with our lower quartile students (math instruction). Established tutoring support for students (before and after school). Co-teach math and ELA classes. AVID strategies (organizational skills with binders, and note taking strategies). Faculty / Staff mentor program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on our previous year's student achievement data (ESSA, FSA scores, AIMS), implementing these strategies will directly address areas of concern for our lowest quartile students by focusing on reading comprehension and reading fluency,

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

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

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

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

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

Departmental visits with technology coach.

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

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

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reducing the achievement gap in all curricular areas. By reducing the achievement gap, more specifically by increasing the scores of our African American students, we will create a more equitable learning environment for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the ELA and Math achievement gap by 3 percentage points. Increase AIMS scores in ELA and Math for African American Students by 10% from Q1 to Q3.
Monitoring:	Quarterly Progress Monitoring Scores
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Restorative practice for discipline purposes. Teacher Professional Development for Culturally Responsive teaching. Providing extra supports to African American student who were placed in advanced course through AVID.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we are able to discipline students and correct behavior without keeping them out of class, they are exposed to more instructional time in the classroom. By providing teachers with profession development for culturally responsive teaching we are helping them to better teach all students. AVID allows for extra targeted support to all students in advanced courses.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Professional development focused on equity.

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

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

Person Responsible Cheryl Alexaitis (alexaicc@gm.sbac.edu)

Focus on restorative actions to keep students in the classroom.

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

Professional Development for faculty on unintentional targeting and implicit bias.

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

Collaborative Planning days.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase the use of multi-tiered system of supports and problem-solving processes with all students with and without disabilities. By providing students with tiered systems of support, and different problem solving processes, we are able to support students both behaviorally and academically. The behavior support will help to keep students in the classroom which will help to increase their academic performance. MTSS will allow us to monitor student progress and implement different supports as needed.

Measurable Outcome: Decrease the suspension rate of students with disabilities by 5%.

Monitoring: Quarterly Discipline Data in Skyward

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: David Hardy (hardydl@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS; acknowledge and reward positive behaviors across campus), EPT meetings (Educational Planning Teams; meetings to discuss students needs and to monitor their progress both academically and behaviorally), implementing FBAs and BIPs (Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavior Intervention Plan; identifying the targeted behavior issue and implementing a plan to reduce the problem behavior).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we identify the problem behavior and implement a plan to decrease the behavior, students will spend less time out of class for discipline reasons. By monitoring students progress monthly and rewarding students for positive behavior, we are keeping them in class and teaching the correct behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

School-wide PBIS plan to support positive behavior.

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

Develop and implement a MTSS team to monitor students

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

Monthly EPT meetings

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

Professional Development for FBAs and BIPs

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students With Disabilities (as a subgroup) have under-performed at Westwood Middle School, achieving at a rate of 30%. We intend to ensure that these students' needs are being met both academically and behaviorally.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the federal index for SWD students by 11% to achieve the required 41%
Increase AIMS scores in ELA and Math for African American Students by 15% from Q1 to Q3.

Monitoring: Quarterly Progress Monitoring Scores

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kim Guido (guidokb@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady program
Co-Teach classes within Science, Math, ELA, and Social Studies
Data Analysis meetings between district personnel and faculty
Professional Development addressing "rigor"

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: iReady program will help scaffold and support ELA
Co-Teach classes to offer further support and differentiation in the general education classroom setting
Data Analysis meetings will help inform, examine and focus teachers to areas that need the most attention
Professional Development will ensure that students are receiving the depth of material that they need in order to succeed while not overwhelming them with unnecessary extra work.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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 ranked as "very High" for incidents compared to other Florida Middle Schools. The data is from the '19-'20 school year and showed a significant decrease from the previous years. This past year also showed a decrease at Westwood across grade levels and ESSA subgroups. Nevertheless, there are still areas that need improvement. First, Westwood shows a disproportionate number of incidents relating to African American Students. to address that issue, the staff will be trained in de-escalation and culturally responsive teaching techniques. Second, there needs to be a greater focus on positive reinforcement and parent involvement early on in the discipline process. To that end, we are implementing the HERO system to assist with our PBIS efforts.

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.

Our PBIS team and goals are the primary source for creating a positive school culture at Westwood Middle School. We are committed to seeing all discipline through an instructional lens, teaching students about expectations and rewarding instances of growth and exceptional behavior. Our SAC team has been and will continue to be involved in this endeavor. It represents a sampling of all stakeholders and continues to encourage Westwood leadership in the areas of PBIS and student academic growth. Recently, they approved the use of HERO software in order to track and communicate student behavior throughout the school year. It provides yet another link to stakeholders as we create a positive culture on campus.

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

We involve stakeholders from the community through events such as Science Night, Cambridge Open House, Meet the Teacher, and AVID Night. It is our intent that community members, parents, students, and faculty and staff should all know the goals of Westwood as well as the plans for reaching them.