

Orange County Public Schools

# Westpointe Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Westpointe Elementary

7525 WESTPOINTE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Atresa Grubbs Holmes**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2019

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 77%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (63%)<br>2018-19: B (58%)<br>2017-18: A (63%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Westpointe Elementary

7525 WESTPOINTE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2021-22 Title I School</b> | <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                               | No                            | 77%   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | No                            | 76%   |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2021-22</b> | <b>2020-21</b> | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | A              | A              | B              | B              |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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  |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Grubbs-Holmes, Atresa | Principal           | <p>Dr. Grubbs provides guidance for the school to use standards-based instruction and data-driven decisions and ensures that the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process with fidelity. She monitors the leadership team and ensures that all aspects of school functions are running efficiently and effectively. Through her leadership, the team is able to make decisions about students to determine and implement best practices based on students' needs. Furthermore, Dr. Grubbs ensures that the team implements common planning effectively. She provides professional development opportunities at Westpointe Elementary as well as at other Orange County Public Schools locations. Dr. Grubbs continuously works on improving standards-based instruction and classroom management by conducting daily classroom walk-throughs and providing actionable feedback to staff to improve instructional best practices.</p> |
| Shaw, Susan           | Assistant Principal | <p>Ms. Shaw assists the principal in the implementation of the common vision and ensures that the staff is implementing standards-based instruction by providing guidance and leadership to the staff. Through her leadership, the team is able to make informed decisions in implementing best practices. Ms. Shaw facilitates weekly core team meetings to review and discuss school data. She meets weekly to discuss the intensity of Tier 1 and Tier 2 intervention and enrichment to students, as needed. She also supervises and evaluates personnel in terms of their performances and responsibilities to support the school-wide goals.</p>  |
| Mauvais, Jeanine      | School Counselor    | <p>Ms. Mauvais coordinates with Westpointe staff, district staffing specialist, itinerant teachers, evaluators, service providers, families, and parent representatives to convene Individual Educational Plans (IEPs), MTSS Tier 3 Educational Planning Team, matrix and audits. She schedules and facilitates 504 meetings with the school psychologists and the MTSS coach to identify specific student needs. Ms. Mauvais assists with the development of IEP's for students, conducts initial gifted screenings, develops health plans, and coordinates social worker referrals. She provides social skills lessons and ensures that students receive mental support, as needed. She is also the Threat Assessment lead and the DCF contact.</p>  |
| Smith, Carol          | Instructional Coach | <p>Ms. Smith oversees the implementation of the MTSS process at Westpointe. She works closely with the staffing coordinator, school psychologist, and teachers by collecting and analyzing student data so they can make informed decisions. She provides research-based intervention strategies and instruction. Ms. Smith participates in common planning, provides guidance in the reading curriculum, and collaborates with classroom teachers to deliver the appropriate interventions based on students' needs.</p> <p>Ms. Smith facilitates the MTSS process by meeting with the MTSS team to collaborate on student data to ensure the tiered intervention and support</p>   |



| Name                | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
|                     |                     | <p>system is being implemented with fidelity. Ms. Smith monitors the implementation of interventions through classroom observations, team meetings and data chats. She provides professional development on the MTSS process for the entire staff including the staffing specialist.</p>  |
| Oakley, Deborah     | Science Coach       | <p>Ms. Oakley provides instructional coaching and supports fourth and fifth-grade teachers with science instruction in the science lab. Her responsibilities include analyzing mini and unit formative assessments, progress monitoring assessments, and facilitating PLCs. She provides instruction to teachers and students daily on the science standards, in the science lab and in classrooms.</p>           |
| Pagan, Agnes        | Instructional Coach | <p>As the ESOL Curriculum Compliance Teacher (CCT), Ms. Pagan's responsibilities include coordinating with school staff and the district compliance specialist to monitor programs and services to students classified as English Language Learners (ELLs). She completes documentation for ELL compliance. Ms. Pagan provides research-based recommendations, intervention, and instruction to ELL teachers.</p> |
| Wesolowski, Rebecca | Instructional Media | <p>Ms. Wesolowski provides support to staff and students on District Curriculum Technology Learning. She leads media instruction with students and is the School News coordinator. She conducts property inventory and coordinates the wellness program. Ms. Wesolowski coordinates the Battle of the Books and Girls On The Run programs. She is the Sky Cap alternative for Westpointe Elementary.</p>          |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Friday 7/12/2019, Atresa Grubbs Holmes

**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.*

3

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

727

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

3

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

8

**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                              | 124         | 123 | 102 | 124 | 137 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 726   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 4           | 43  | 27  | 32  | 42  | 22  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 170   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 3   | 0   | 1   | 4   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 12  | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 6   | 12  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 23  | 24  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 4   | 24  | 25  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

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           | 2 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46    |

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     | 1           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/18/2022

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

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**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             | 68%    | 56%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 67%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 69%    |          |       |        |          |       | 65%    | 58%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 50%    |          |       |        |          |       | 58%    | 52%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 67%    | 46%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 70%    | 63%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 72%    |          |       |        |          |       | 54%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 37%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 54%    | 61%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 54%    | 56%      | 53%   |

**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 |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 53%    | 55%      | -2%                        | 58%   | -5%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 62%    | 57%      | 5%                         | 58%   | 4%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -53%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 54%      | 0%                         | 56%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -62%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 67%    | 62%      | 5%                         | 62%   | 5%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 60%    | 63%      | -3%                        | 64%   | -4%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -67%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 60%    | 57%      | 3%                         | 60%   | 0%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -60%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|         | 2019 | 51%    | 54%      | -3%                        | 53%   | -2%                     |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**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                                       | 25       |        |             | 38        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 69       | 69     | 55          | 69        | 78      | 76           | 51       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 62       | 68     | 54          | 60        | 68      | 44           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 71       | 69     | 48          | 71        | 74      | 72           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 65       | 67     |             | 65        | 67      |              | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 63       | 59     | 35          | 59        | 64      | 50           | 51       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 8        |        |             | 31        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 59       | 65     | 81          | 63        | 75      | 83           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 50       | 63     |             | 48        | 32      |              | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 61       | 70     | 85          | 63        | 72      | 93           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 61       | 40     |             | 65        | 67      |              | 71       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 55       | 62     | 80          | 56        | 60      | 67           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 15       |        |             | 15        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 60       | 72     | 66          | 74        | 57      | 36           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 83       |        |             | 83        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 57       | 41     |             | 69        | 49      |              | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 64       | 70     | 58          | 66        | 50      | 36           | 49       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 83       | 70     |             | 83        | 67      |              | 69       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 64       | 66     | 55          | 66        | 52      | 35           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |

**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)                 | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students         | 64   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO   |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 73   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 512  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |

| <b>Subgroup Data</b> |  |
|----------------------|--|
|----------------------|--|

| <b>Students With Disabilities</b> |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
|-----------------------------------|--|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 32  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

| <b>English Language Learners</b> |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
|----------------------------------|--|

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                | 68 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

| <b>Native American Students</b> |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
|---------------------------------|--|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 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   |

| <b>Asian Students</b> |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|-----------------------|--|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students                                |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

| <b>Black/African American Students</b> |  |
|--|--|
|--|--|

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 58 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

| <b>Hispanic Students</b> |  |
|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--|

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students                                | 66 |
| 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   | 65  |
| 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                                | 56  |
| 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?**

Based on 2022 FSA data, overall ELA and Math proficiency rose by 3%.

Third-grade Math scores saw the most significant gains in Math, with an 11% from 2021. Fourth-grade Math saw a 1% increase, with only fifth-grade losing 2%.

Third and fourth grades rose 4% in ELA, with the fifth grade gaining 2%.

Fifth grade Science scores dropped 8% from 53% in 2021 to 45% in 2022. This was the lowest of the three core content scores.

Learning Gains increased by 6% in ELA and 10% in Math on the 2022 FSAs. The Lowest 25% Learning Gains dropped this year by 33% in ELA and 15% in Math.

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



Fifth-grade Science data demonstrate a need for improvement, with a drop of 8% in 2022 - from 53% in 2021 to 45%. This is compared to a district percentage of 52 and a state percentage of 48.

A second component that demonstrates a need for improvement is the Learning Gains for the lowest quartile of students. Both ELA and Math dropped significantly - ELA 83% to 50% and Math 74% to 59%.

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

In 2021/22, the Science coach returned to a classroom position due to a shortage of teachers. Opportunities for hands-on experiments and comprehensive science instruction decreased. This year, the Science coach will return to the STEM/Science Lab to provide lessons and practice to fourth and fifth-grade students. She will also progress monitor students and analyze data for weaknesses to be addressed. Weekly meetings with classroom teachers will enable gaps in instruction to be met both in the classroom and in the Lab.

One factor contributing to the decline in Learning Gains of the lowest quartile is the inconsistency in providing small-group differentiated instruction to support and meet individual students' needs. Flexible, differentiated groupings based on individual needs will be initiated to support low-performing students. The intensive tiered intervention will also be provided to the lowest 25% of students by adding two Intervention Teachers.

Another factor contributing to the performance decline is continued attendance, tardiness, and early dismissal rate. Communication with parents about school attendance policies and careful monitoring will assist with this problem.

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

Third-grade Math scores showed the most improvement - 55% in 2021 to 66% in 2022.

Overall, ELA FSA scores increased by 9% and Math FSA scores increased by 7%.

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

Professional Development in the McCarthy Math Academy program was provided to all teachers and used with fidelity. Third-grade teachers, in particular, embraced the program, and the students were excited to learn.

Data were monitored frequently in PLCs with reteaching lessons and extra practice planned, as needed.

Professional Development targeting student engagement through a book study of "The Wild Card" by Hope and Wade King was held with third grade focusing on this area for their Deliberate Practice. Engaging, targeted skill lessons were met with student enthusiasm.

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

Flexible, differentiated learning groups will be created in each classroom and grade level using relevant, timely data. Teachers will be monitored for consistent use of small groups, and data will be reviewed weekly at PLCs. Intervention Teachers and Science teachers will also be included in PLCs to assist with monitoring and planning.

**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 new to the school will be provided Professional Development targeting student engagement through creative instructional strategies with "The Wild Card" book study.

Sarah McCarthy of McCarthy Math Academy will again provide Professional Development, which will incorporate the new BEST Standards.

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

The principal will facilitate data meetings and support teachers through extra planning days to analyze data to create small groups to differentiate instruction for all students, focusing on the lowest quartile. The tiered intervention will ensure these students are kept in small groups to accelerate learning.

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

The Social Worker will monitor absenteeism and tardies and support families as needed. Families will be connected with appropriate resources.

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

The Staffing Specialist/LEA will monitor compliance with accommodations for students with IEPs and 504 plans. She will work with teachers to provide training and assistance in using Universal Design for Learning strategies in planning for instruction to support our SWD.

A team comprised of school leaders and teachers will focus on promoting a positive school culture through a school-wide positive behavior recognition program for all students.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Our fifth-grade Statewide Science score fell from 53% to 45%. Having guided support in the area of science will assist in the lesson planning process and implementation of standards-based science lessons, which will cause an increase in student achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 or above on the Statewide Science assessment will increase from 45% to 60%.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Progress monitoring data will be analyzed by classroom teachers, the Science coach, resource teachers, and administration. Lesson plans will be reviewed and classroom and lab walk-throughs will be conducted to ensure standards-based instruction and provide feedback.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

A science coach will implement a science coaching model to support classroom instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The science coach will model and implement standards-based lesson planning with clearly defined learning goals to allow teachers and students to understand what they are to know and do at the end of each lesson. Teachers will stay focused on the desired target of the lesson.

**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.

Implement a science lab rotation that will allow students to participate in hands-on experiments and standards review of prior grade-level content that is assessed on the Statewide Science Assessment.

**Person Responsible**

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

Provide instructional coaching to support science instruction in the classrooms. Classroom teachers will provide students with standards-based instruction, as well as strategies to aid students in the development of critical thinking skills to the extent they will be capable of generating and testing hypotheses in the classroom and lab environments.

**Person Responsible**

Deborah Oakley (deborah.oakley@ocps.net)

Participate in grade level common planning to ensure standards-based lesson planning for the classroom is at a high level of rigor and academic science vocabulary is presented and reviewed.

**Person Responsible**

Deborah Oakley (deborah.oakley@ocps.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:**

We will develop and implement the use of flexible grouping in the classroom and on the grade levels with targeted, differentiated instruction based on students' needs. Two Intervention teachers will be assigned to work with students based on data. When the 21/22 Statewide Assessment data was reviewed, a critical need was determined to be the lowest quartile of students dropped in both ELA and Math learning gains in 2022. ELA dropped from 83% to 50% and Math dropped from 74% to 59%. The majority of our SWD are reflected in this lowest quartile of students.

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

We will see an increase in learning gains in our lowest quartile of students on the statewide assessments. With the new FAST assessments being administered in the 22/23 school year, the gains will not be comparable to the FSA assessments in 21/22. Instead, we will achieve an increase in learning gains of 65% from the first to the third assessment.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Leadership will attend weekly grade-level PLCs to review data and lesson planning. Data will be analyzed by classroom and intervention teachers and specific, targeted lessons will be planned to provide needed differentiation in both ELA and math.

**Person**

**responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Small group differentiated instruction will be implemented during the Reading block and Intervention time. ESE students will receive instruction/facilitation services with the ESE teacher according to their IEPs. Classroom observations and student assessment data will be used to determine the effectiveness of this strategy.

**Rationale for Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Grouping students to focus on their specific standard deficiencies will help teachers (classroom and intervention) work with students in their areas of need. Teachers will assign students to groups based on explicit learning goals, monitor peer interactions, and provide positive and corrective feedback to support productive learning. Teachers will use small learning groups to accommodate learning differences, promote in-depth academic-related interactions and teach students to work collaboratively.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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.

The lowest quartile students will be identified according to statewide assessment data. Specific areas of need will be identified.

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

Monitor differentiated instruction during classroom and intervention observation and provide actionable feedback as needed.

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

Use PLCs to collaboratively plan for small group instruction that is data-driven.

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

**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.**

Westpointe Elementary will continue to support strategies learned through the implementation of the CASEL Core Competencies. This previous training provided a common language to support strategies for student success and positive school culture and environment.

All stakeholders, staff, students, parents, and the community have a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment. The staff works with parents outside of the classroom at school events and through community partnerships.

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

School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders through interaction with the School Advisory Council and PTA to reflect on school processes and determine the next steps to promote a positive learning environment and culture.

Westpointe Elementary utilizes staff such as the ESOL Compliance Teacher to bridge the community and school culture. Ms. Pagan is familiar with all ELL families and encourages frequent communication between home and school, providing in-person translation whenever possible and utilizing OCPS translation services when needed. She also coordinates a Family Cultural Night when families are encouraged to bring traditional food, dress, and other cultural items from their countries to share.

The school social worker will continue to provide social skills lessons. Mrs. Mauvais has also coordinated a Kindness Club for students that meets once a week to encourage students and staff through special projects and events. She promotes other safe and healthy programs throughout the year such as Red

Ribbon Week, Start with Hello, and Unity Day.

We will continue to implement our positive behavior recognition program for students throughout the year. Students will be recognized for positive behavior, grades and/or effort at each Progress Report and Report Card period. Recognizing positive behavior through frequent celebrations promotes an environment conducive to learning.

A Cheer Committee provides positive celebrations and interactions for staff members throughout the year. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy.