# Westwood Middle School

**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Westwood Middle School

## 1262 NW 31ST DRIVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

### https://www.sbac.edu/westwood

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1.  Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2.  Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3.  Have a school grade of D or F; or
4.  Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|---|---|---|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

**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 Department 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.

# 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 will learn to be college and career ready and achieve their potential.

## School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

### School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Burney, Daniel | Principal | Oversee School Improvement Process and providing support where needed |
| McLeod, Lisa | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Curriculum - oversee and support curriculum instruction |
| Williams, Ernest | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Administration - oversee and support discipline and Student Services |
| MacEwan, Jennifer | School Counselor | School Counselor - support students' social and emotional development and growth, support student services - IEPs, Gifted, guiding students in their career and college readiness planning. |
| Lugo Hampton, Cynthia | Dean | Implement discipline plan, educate students on school expectations, work with teachers to keep classrooms safe while maximizing all students' instructional time. |
| Falvey, Davis | Teacher, K-12 | Implement PBIS Plan |

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Previous SAC meetings have provided input in the development of the SIP; as well as Parent Involvement Meetings, our PTSA, faculty meetings - input from team leaders and department chair meetings were also instrumental in helping to develop the School Improvement Plan.

**SIP Monitoring**
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored quarterly as we look at testing, discipline, and attendance data during Student Service meetings, SAC meetings and faculty meetings. We will discuss elements to continue that are helping us in our endeavor to improve students' academic strengths and revise what is not creating improvement.

| Demographic Data | |
|---|---|
| Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024 | |
| **2023-24 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 |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 67% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 90% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification** *updated as of 3/11/2024 | TSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| **School Grades History** *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating History** | |

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using 2022-23 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 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 63 | 83 | 227 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 63 | 62 | 146 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 49 | 40 | 147 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 85 | 45 | 180 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 82 | 89 | 253 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 95 | 90 | 292 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 82 | 89 | 253 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 125 | 123 | 363 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 16 |

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 63 | 83 | 227 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 63 | 62 | 146 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 49 | 40 | 147 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 85 | 45 | 180 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 82 | 89 | 253 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 95 | 90 | 292 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 82 | 89 | 253 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 125 | 123 | 363 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 16 |

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 63 | 83 | 227 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 63 | 62 | 146 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 49 | 40 | 147 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 85 | 45 | 180 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 82 | 89 | 253 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 95 | 90 | 292 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 82 | 89 | 253 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 125 | 123 | 363 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 16 |

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 45 | 49 | 49 | 48 | 51 | 50 | 54 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 49 | | | 57 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 34 | | | 42 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 43 | 51 | 56 | 44 | 34 | 36 | 49 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 46 | | | 45 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 38 | | | 34 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 43 | 46 | 49 | 43 | 51 | 53 | 47 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 50 | 58 | 68 | 59 | 54 | 58 | 58 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 67 | 75 | 73 | 74 | 40 | 49 | 72 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 45 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 61 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 65 | 48 | 40 | 52 | 80 | 76 | 57 | | |

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 52 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 313 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 49 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 487 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 10 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| ELL | 39 | Yes | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 73 | | | |
| BLK | 24 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| HSP | 42 | | | |
| MUL | 61 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | | | |
| FRL | 34 | Yes | 2 | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 23 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 67 | | | |
| BLK | 29 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| HSP | 47 | | | |
| MUL | 61 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | |
| FRL | 38 | Yes | 1 | |

## Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 45 | | | 43 | | | 43 | 50 | 67 | | | 65 |
| SWD | 10 | | | 11 | | | 8 | 11 | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 35 | | | 39 | | | 24 | 30 | | | 5 | 65 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | | | 75 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 21 | | | 16 | | | 10 | 33 | 40 | | 5 | |
| HSP | 43 | | | 36 | | | 33 | 21 | 56 | | 6 | 62 |
| MUL | 55 | | | 48 | | | 68 | 65 | 71 | | 5 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | | | 70 | | | 71 | 74 | 73 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 32 | | | 28 | | | 24 | 39 | 60 | | 6 | 23 |

| | 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 48 | 49 | 34 | 44 | 46 | 38 | 43 | 59 | 74 | | | 52 |
| SWD | 17 | 35 | 26 | 11 | 28 | 33 | 17 | 16 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 38 | 32 | 32 | 46 | 37 | 39 | 27 | | | | 52 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 62 | 48 | | 68 | 64 | | 67 | | 92 | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 30 | 23 | 17 | 33 | 34 | 11 | 29 | 65 | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 55 | 54 | 36 | 47 | 44 | 34 | 51 | 63 | | | 50 |
| MUL | 57 | 58 | | 53 | 47 | | 63 | 62 | 84 | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 61 | 52 | 68 | 54 | 52 | 67 | 84 | 74 | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 42 | 35 | 28 | 37 | 35 | 27 | 41 | 66 | | | |

| | 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 54 | 57 | 42 | 49 | 45 | 34 | 47 | 58 | 72 | | | 57 |
| SWD | 16 | 30 | 29 | 14 | 28 | 26 | 14 | 23 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 63 | 62 | 24 | 42 | 46 | 11 | 53 | | | | 57 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | 53 |
| MUL | 62 | 61 | | 54 | 45 | | 41 | 70 | 62 | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 70 | 43 | 76 | 60 | 29 | 77 | 79 | 79 | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 44 | 40 | 26 | 30 | 32 | 19 | 44 | 45 | | | 70 |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 46% | -9% | 47% | -10% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 47% | -3% | 47% | -3% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 47% | -6% | 47% | -6% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 47% | -9% | 54% | -16% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 19% | 24% | -5% | 48% | -29% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 57% | -10% | 55% | -8% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 44% | -3% | 44% | -3% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 78% | 52% | 26% | 50% | 28% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 92% | 57% | 35% | 48% | 44% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 58% | -13% | 66% | -21% |

# III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Using 2022 data, it showed that ELA lowest quartile had the lowest performance. Their gains were 34%. This is down from the 41% gains our LQ students showed in 2019. The contributing factor was consistency in instruction from certified teachers. Moving forward, we are taking steps to ensure that we are fully staffed with highly qualified teachers. Also to provide on-going support for all new teachers and professional development in the areas of Webb's Depth of Knowledge and the gradual release model

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

The 2022 data shows that the greatest decline was in Math. The change in proficiency fell from 57% in 2019 to 44% in 2022. This was reflected across all grades. The factors that may have contributed to this is not having consistency in all teachers knowing and using best practices that reach our Students with Disabilities, as well as recovery from COVID learning loss. As mentioned above, we are providing more professional development for all teachers, with a focus on new teachers and any with alternate certification.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Comparing the 2022 data between Westwood's average and the state average, Westwood's Math achievement had the greatest gap. The state's average was 54%; Westwood's average is 44%. Looking back over the data, we attribute this gap to learning loss during COVID and not having consistency in all teachers knowing and using best practices that reach our Students with Disabilities.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

According to the 2022 data, and after comparing there were no areas which showed the most improvement. All areas showed a decline from 2019. ELA: 55% (2019) to 48% (2022); Math: 57% (2019) to 44% (2022); Science: 56% (2019) to 43% (2022); Social Studies: 69% (2019) to 59% (2022); and Middle School Acceleration dropped from 84% (2019) to 74% (2022).

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

After reviewing the EWS data, two areas of concern are how many students who are at a Level 1 in Reading and Math- 253 and 292, respectively

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

Highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are first, lowering the number of students who are absent 10% or more days during the year. Based on last year's data, we had 227 students who were in this category.
These missed days almost directly correlate to our 2nd and 3rd priorities, which are identifying and working with students who are at a Level 1 in Math(292) and Reading (253) to increase their proficiency levels.

**Area of Focus**
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Westwood's area of focus in relation to instructional practices is setting clear academic goals on a daily basis.

### Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

All academic classroom teachers will post standards based lesson objectives and essential questions for their students.

### Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The principal, APA, and APC will monitor the lesson objective and essential questions for each grade level on a weekly basis via regular walk-throughs.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Burney (burneyde@gm.sbac.edu)

### Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

This evidence-based instructional practice of board configuration supports our district-wide goal of establishing clear academic goals each day for our students. Teachers at Westwood will also receive professional development support in the areas of Webb's Depth of Knowledge and Gradual Release to enhance the instructional setting and delivery of instruction.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We want to ensure that students are able to immediately access what they should be able to know, understand, and do at the conclusion of each core academic class. When students are presented with clear academic goals, learning is accessible to all students.

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

### 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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In order to create a more positive, consistent, and constructive learning environment, all teachers will implement classroom procedures and expectations that are conducive to promoting learning and student engagement in the classroom.
This will foster an environment where students feel more supportive and drawn into the learning process. Due to this, we will see higher attendance, a decrease in behavior-related referrals and out-of-school suspensions.

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

Within the school year, these practices will reduce behavior referrals by 10% (especially Tier 1 behavior-related referrals) and improve attendance by 10%. When students feel more included in the classroom, both attendance and behavior will improve.

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

Referral data and attendance data through the Report Server. It will also be discussed during our weekly Student Services meetings, which include administration, deans, counselors, family liaison, attendance clerk, and McKenny Vento advocate.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ernest Williams (williamsec1@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will utilize our district and school-based PBIS structure to support implementation for this area of focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The PBIS system is district supports and is aligned with our CORE principle of building rapport and relationships. The Westwood system of RRS (Raise Responsibility System) works with the principles of PBIS to have students self-reflect on behavior choices and behavior outcomes. This is support by PBIS data and research.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Review and reflect quarterly (more if needed) on the effectiveness of in-place PBIS strategies and revise as needed

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

**By When:** each quarter (with the option of every 4 weeks as needed) culminating with year-end data

**#3. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase the average achievement for students in our ESSA subgroups in all State assessments (FAST ELA & Math, Civics, Science) by 5% for the 2023-2024 school year. This will put many of ESSA subgroups close to where they were pre-pandemic. Our highest level of success was in 2018-2019 when many of our subgroups were 40% or higher on the FSA. The 21-22 data shows a significant drop in achievement with our ESSA subgroups with many students scoring below 35% on state testing.

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

Monitor FAST and AIMS results. Work with teachers and literary specialist, Ms. Stephanie Garvin, using the data to identify students who are close to moving up a level and create specialized targeted Tier 3 groups to work with to increase the average achievement for students in our ESSA subgroups in all State assessments (FAST ELA & Math, Civics, Science) by 5% for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Monitor FAST and AIMS, iReady, and IXL results quarterly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lisa McLeod (mcleodlm@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Work with teachers and district specialists, using the data to identify students who are close to moving up a level and create specialized targeted Tier 3 groups to work with.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Westwood's ESSA subgroups have traditionally scored below grade level in State assessments.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Monitor FAST and AIMS results for progress with ESSA subgroups. Keep this a focus with classroom Snapshots and Observations.

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

**By When:** Each quarter, culminating with year-end progress as shown with FAST PM 3 testing data