Westridge Middle

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Westridge Middle

3800 W OAK RIDGE RD, Orlando, FL 32809

https://westridgems.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Jefferson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2019

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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 White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (39%)
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	TSI
* 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

Westridge Middle

3800 W OAK RIDGE RD, Orlando, FL 32809

https://westridgems.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gonzalez, Dennis	Principal	Site leader, oversees and manages all developments from academic progression to student safety and teacher/support staffing.
Vitulli, Emilio	Assistant Principal	Oversees science and civics, helps with all other duties as assigned by the superintendent and principal.
Harper, Sarah	Assistant Principal	Oversees Mathematics, helps with all other duties as assigned by the superintendent and principal.
Vereen, Debra	Assistant Principal	Oversees and monitors data for ELA and reading, helps manage, coach and develop instructors within that department. Helps with supervision and safety, as well as serving any and all other duties as assigned by the superintendent and principal.
Martis, Kayla	ELL Compliance Specialist	Oversees testing, accomodations and structures of any and all assessments in the building.
Reams, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Oversees the development of instructional staff within the reading and ELA department. Assists with interventions and supervision.
Burnett, Cecile	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Maintains curriculum development and helps with the structures of interventions and student support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/12/2019, Nicole Jefferson

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

10

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

85

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,274

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

24

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

24

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	409	407	385	0	0	0	0	1201
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	142	153	0	0	0	0	414
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	15	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	56	135	0	0	0	0	266
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	56	93	0	0	0	0	216
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	96	115	0	0	0	0	318
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	101	131	0	0	0	0	324
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	268	248	260	0	0	0	0	776

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	125	129	189	0	0	0	0	443

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/12/2022

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	425	420	400	8	0	0	0	1253
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	139	153	6	0	0	0	414
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	15	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	56	135	5	0	0	0	271
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	56	93	3	0	0	0	219
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	96	115	5	0	0	0	323
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	101	131	4	0	0	0	328
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	129	125	189	6	0	0	0	449

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	5	7	0	0	0	0	16

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	425	420	400	8	0	0	0	1253
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	139	153	6	0	0	0	414
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	15	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	56	135	5	0	0	0	271
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	56	93	3	0	0	0	219
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	96	115	5	0	0	0	323
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	101	131	4	0	0	0	328
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	129	125	189	6	0	0	0	449

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	5	7	0	0	0	0	16

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	27%	49%	50%				31%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						42%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						39%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	38%	36%	36%				35%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%						45%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						46%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	55%	53%				29%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	45%	61%	58%				43%	67%	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	2022					
	2019	33%	52%	-19%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	21%	48%	-27%	52%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2022					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	56%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	33%	43%	-10%	55%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	19%	49%	-30%	54%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2022					
	2019	17%	36%	-19%	46%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	25%	49%	-24%	48%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	39%	66%	-27%	71%	-32%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	84%	63%	21%	61%	23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	91%	53%	38%	57%	34%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	7	31	30	18	47	56	12	26			
ELL	17	39	33	30	58	69	17	35	86		
ASN	31	69		62	77						
BLK	30	41	34	37	56	67	34	45	80		
HSP	24	39	32	38	62	70	34	45	87		
WHT	29	38		52	71		50				
FRL	29	41	34	40	59	71	38	46	84		
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	20	18	10	28	39	5	27			
ELL	17	33	34	25	42	52	8	34	52		
ASN	40	53		58	42						

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
BLK	33	40	31	35	44	47	32	51	68		
HSP	32	40	36	37	42	51	31	40	67		
MUL	18	10		33	33						
WHT	55	43		35	22			70			
FRL	31	38	32	36	42	46	31	47	68		

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	6	27	22	12	36	39	16	13			
ELL	20	39	39	28	40	42	16	30	76		
ASN	63	58		74	58				100		
BLK	32	43	36	33	43	45	27	43	80		
HSP	28	41	42	35	46	45	27	40	81		
WHT	37	38		41	54						
FRL	30	42	43	35	45	50	29	43	78		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	28
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Of tested students we show trends of low performance within our ESSA specific categories of ELL/ESE and our striving 25%. Specifically related to SWD students we tested 88% and found heavy needs for learning gains in ELA and Mathematics.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Specific components of data show a need for learning gains in ELA for SWD students where we only achieved 20% learning gains. As for Mathematics within the same category we attained learning gains of 28%. In the subgroup of ELL students we tested 95% and reached 33% learning gains for ELA and 52% learning gains for mathematics. Still leaving plenty of room for improvement for all subgroups in each component of category.

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

Contributing factors affecting performance and development range from attendance, to mobility (students incoming/outgoing). In addition to this, attainment of highly qualified instructors, building capacity of teachers within the building and the proper release of content within instruction in conjunction with instructional strategies in place. We find that the new actions to be taken to address this need for improvement include the use of interventions and supporting our teachers with training on best instructional practices available, as well as rendering student support as needed through the implementation of a solid MTSS process.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our mathematics performance showed the most improvement in performance, particularly within the striving 25% population, where we reached 52% learning gains.

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

Contributing factors for this improvement ranged from acquisition of highly qualified instructors, to interventions, tutoring, identification of student needs, implementation of MTSS and professional development.

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

In order to accelerate learning we will include the specific targeting of students within buckets of learning in levels of performance. For instance targeting our level 2 performers to strive forward and progress through extensive interventions and provided tutoring.

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.

We provide professional development for teachers every single Wednesday after school and every single week in our planning conferences. Instructional coaches mentor new teachers and we also implement peer observation times for teachers to learn from one another and/or participate in lesson studies.

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

Trainings that are geared to specifically provide instruction for student population heavy with the specific subgroups that our student population contains, for example ESE students, ELL students and also for our striving 25%. The goal is to build not only capacity within the rigor of our instruction, but also longevity in practice and growth in results.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Using ESSA subgroup data we identified our needs of improvement in performance. 88% of our ESE tested students showed a 20% learning gains in ELA, while showing a 28% in learning gains for Mathematics. Within the same ranging category, the striving 25% attained learning gains of 39%. For our ELL students we tested 95% and found that learning gains within this subgroup for ELA reached 33% and 42% for Mathematics. Within the ELL category, the 25% of striving learners reached 52% of learning gains in mathematics and 34% in ELA.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We plan to increase school-wide performance by scoring in accordance to the district or at least a 64% in measurement of proficiency for each tested category. We hope to increase learning gains for ESE,ELL and striving 25% to 54% in each category.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor data through ESSA reports, LEXIA English, LEXIA PowerUP, Reading Plus, SIPPS, WIDA ACCESS scores, FSA and PMA performance results. Furthermore, we tier our students and teachers in order to best serve our student and teacher needs. We conduct on average 75 classroom walks per administrator within each three week period. We share and maintain trends with one another as well as the district. We disaggregate assessment data and develop interventions and action plans internally and with the district.We monitor our growth and take action to decrease gaps within each subgroup and targeted group daily.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dennis Gonzalez (dennis.gonzalez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	We have grown each of the past three years in all of our tested subject areas, reaching the highest school grade since the inception of the school this past year. Historical ESSA data dating back to 2018 shows that Westridge was performing at 23% learning gains within the ESE subgroup in ELA and 38% for ELL students. Meanwhile reaching 20% in learning gains for ESE students in ELA and 33% learning gains for ELL students in the same category for the year 2022. Our implemented strategies in the areas of focus have rendered to score increases as in the year 2021 our ESE students reached learning gains of 19% in ELA and our ELL students reached learning gains of 33% in ELA. Our strategies

implemented for this Area of Focus.	focus on the improvement or reading fluency as well as interventions in areas of need within mathematics, ELA, Science and CIVICS. By improving reading proficiency and fluency we also hope to improve language attainment, content understanding and content language within each performing student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	88% of our ESE tested students showed a 20% learning gains in ELA, while showing a 28% in learning gains for Mathematics. Within the same ranging category, the striving 25% attained learning gains of 39%. For our ELL students we tested 95% and found that learning gains within this subgroup for ELA reached 33% and 42% for Mathematics. Within the ELL category, the 25% of striving learners reached 52% of learning gains in mathematics and 34% in ELA. By focusing on identifying needs and improving/supporting understanding and we hope to positively impact processing so that student depth of knowledge deepens and performance rises. We will show growth, as we have each of the past three years within our testing data and student performance, meanwhile properly servicing our population and maintaining a positive school culture. Our evidence based rationale can be best supported by multiple results of success from various districts and schools that follow similar practices. We plan to increase school-wide performance by scoring in accordance to the district or at least a 64% in measurement of proficiency for each tested category. We hope to increase learning gains for ESE,ELL and striving 25% to 54% in each category.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Through an extensive look at over 200 hours of classroom visits already in the year we have compiled trend walk data and testing data that supports a need for differentiation, not just from one student to the next, but from class period to class period.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	School wide goals have been set by testing area to meet the threshold of 64% proficiency in each by the end of the year (testing time as results). Our objective is to increase capacity of teachers with trainings, coachings and supports, meanwhile fostering academic progression and development through best practices in lesson plans with the purpose of creating best results.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We monitor our areas daily and weekly, through walks, performances in assessments and feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Lesson planning and purposeful planning meetings must be in practice in order to develop the best plans and best use of our time in classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Including district support, internal coaches support, and administrative support, we aim to allow our teachers to be a part of the developing movements for our instructional changes.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We foster safety and promote development of instructional strategies that allow for high level instruction to happen in the classroom, including feedback of all stakeholders within the building and external district stakeholders as well. We work alongside parents and families to meet student needs and make sure that our MTSS process and support resources are thoroughly available for any and all students. We work to create fruitful relationships with staff members in order to help them feel wanted and needed within the building. We also allow for development of leaders and teachers within the building.

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

Administrators, coaches and support district staff help maintain and develop our school culture and environment through trainings, feedback and presence in service. Our teachers are always helpful and ready to serve our families and students. Our support staff members, clerical staff and/or office staff members support the development of our school culture by always stepping up to give stellar customer service.