Westbrooke Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Westbrooke Elementary

500 TOMYN BLVD, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://westbrookees.ocps.net/

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.

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, 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
Reyes, Vidal	Principal	The principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing, and communicating information to enforce school, district and state policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents and community members.
Keysor, Aundrea	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; maintaining a safe school environment, supporting MTSS and testing; and other duties as assigned by the principal.
Medina Piazza, Rosana	School Counselor	The School Counselor provides life skills instruction for students through teaching lessons in the classroom, promoting character education, and hosting small groups for specific needs. Ms. Piazza also acts as Section 504 Coordinator ensuring compliance and supporting the team with determining eligibility.
Rumeau, Whitney	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist provides resources to the staff regarding ESE instruction and monitoring the progress of Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals. She works with the staff to provide our ESE students with support and services in the classroom. Ms. Rumeau also acts as Curriculum Compliance Specialist to provide research-based suggestions for interventions and instruction that best meet ELL students' needs. Mrs. Rumeau also completes all English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) compliance documentation and works with teachers to develop and implement Multi-Tiered Support Structures and intervention plans for struggling ELLs.
Mitchell, Reiko	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist provides access to reading and research material through the media center, as well as supports the technology. Ms. Mitchell also serves as the testing coordinator.

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.

Input was gained from all stakeholders for the SIP development via the Panorama Survey. Additionally, the Leadership Team met over the summer to review data and identify areas to improve. Teacher and Staff input was gained during Pre-planning through activities where we reviewed student data and teams collaborated to share how each felt we could improve as a school. The Panorama Parent survey gained input from parents, families, and the community.

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 regularly monitored to ensure effective implementation and its positive impact on increasing student achievement, especially the achievement of students with the greatest gaps in their learning. The team at Westbrooke Elementary will revise the plan, if necessary at mid-year to ensure continuous 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)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
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	37	16	16	13	14	21	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	16	12	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	11	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	12	7	16	0	0	0	0	43

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	5	4	4	16	12	0	0	0	41

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	7	11	12	17	15	14	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	17	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	12	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	8	12	0	0	0	21

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	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	7	11	12	17	15	14	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	17	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	12	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	8	12	0	0	0	21

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	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	66	57	53	72	56	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				64			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			43		
Math Achievement*	75	60	59	83	46	50	71		
Math Learning Gains				86			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76			40		
Science Achievement*	84	63	54	75	61	59	71		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	81	59	59	88			69		

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](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	27	Yes	2	1
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	64			
HSP	68			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	64			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	69			
HSP	64			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	61			

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	66			75			84					81
SWD	22			33			27				3	
ELL	54			71			84				5	81
AMI												
ASN	85			85							2	
BLK	55			65			71				4	
HSP	58			69			81				5	83
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80			86			91				4	
FRL	56			64			78				5	70

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	72	64	49	83	86	76	75					88
SWD	22	29	10	35	71	67	40					
ELL	65	69	67	79	87	60	53					88
AMI												
ASN	88	82		88	91							

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
BLK	65	56	36	75	87	83	78					
HSP	63	48	42	79	79	67	55					82
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	76	69	89	90	80	86					
FRL	61	47	38	75	84	74	48					

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	68	54	43	71	59	40	71					69
SWD	35	42		38	50		40					
ELL	62			59								69
AMI												
ASN	100			75								
BLK	63	57		59	52		67					
HSP	60	50	40	70	42		65					74
MUL	82			73								
PAC												
WHT	72	52		79	74		80					
FRL	53	51	36	58	49	38	59					61

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
05	2023 - Spring	69%	54%	15%	54%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	60%	13%	58%	15%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	59%	52%	7%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	51%	28%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is our Students with Disabilities (SWD) who demonstrated 39% proficiency. On the Reading portion of the assessment at the Beginning of the Year (BOY) 46% of Students with Disabilities scored at level 1, and at the End of the Year (EOY), 27% of Students with Disabilities scored at level 1. Roughly half of the students demonstrated improvement from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. When looking at the Math portion of the assessment, Students with Disabilities (SWD) fared much better in terms of making gains from the Beginning of the Year, 58% of students were at level 1, and at the End of the Year, 19% of students were at a level 1. Additionally, students in 3rd grade remained at 0% proficiency and students in 4th and 5th grades increased by 25% or more.
Some contributing factors include a limited understanding of differentiated instruction to support the diverse needs of students.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is math K-2 and 5th grade ELA. In math in 2022, 83% of students scored a level of 3 or higher on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), in 2023, 74% of students demonstrated a score of level 3 or higher on the F.A.S.T. assessment. A contributing factor that could have contributed to the decline in scores was the change in standards.
When looking at ELA, in Kindergarten, at the Beginning of the Year 65% of students were proficient, and

at the End of the Year, 58% of students were proficient. In First and Second, students grew by five percentage points. In 5th grade, students grew four percentage points growing from 49% proficient at the beginning of the year to 53% proficient at the End of the Year.

Factors that contributed to this decline were: Limited understanding of differentiated instruction to support the diverse needs of students. Teachers need to improve on providing targeted, differentiated, small-group instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities and those in the Tiers of Support.

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.

When comparing Westbrooke Elementary's data to that of the state, students at Westbrooke are outperforming their peers in the state of Florida in all areas. Students with Disabilities are performing two percentage points above the state average.

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was F.A.S.T. English Language Arts in 3rd and 4th grades. The Beginning of the Year data in 3rd grade showed 31% of all students were proficient, at the End of Year, 60% demonstrated proficiency showing a 29% gain from beginning to end. In 4th grade 43% of students were proficient, and at the End of the Year 60% demonstrated proficiency showing a 27% gain from beginning to end.

Highly structured PLC's and common planning time allowed for teams to increase collaboration and sharing of expertise on standards-based best practices. Additionally, weekly classroom walk-throughs during intervention and small group instruction were consistent practices where actionable feedback was provided. The coaching cycle was utilized to support struggling teachers in increasing their instructional practice.

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

Potential areas for concern are:
1. The number of students who did not demonstrate proficiency level 3 or higher on the F.A.S.T. assessment in ELA and Math.

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

Highest priorities for school improvement at Westbrooke Elementary:
1. Increasing the performance of our Students with Disabilities and the lowest 25%
2. Improving School belonging and climate among Staff and Students.

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

Differentiated and targeted small group instruction in ELA and Math are needed to address the learning needs of all students at Westbrooke Elementary. Specific attention and targeting of SWD (Students with Disabilities) and supporting the bottom 25% as these students performed lower in ELA and Math. Differentiating instruction for students allows teachers to address individual student learning needs in a systematic fashion. The rationale for this area of focus is the learning gains for ELA and Math are significantly lower than that of students in the general education classroom.

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

As a result of small group and differentiated instruction throughout the 2023-2024 school year, students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade will be at 73% in ELA and 77% in math on the 3rd administration of the FAST Assessment. We also expect 75% of students in 5th grade to score at or above achievement level on the 2023 SSA in Science. In addition, as a result of small group instruction, we expect 70% of students in kindergarten through 2nd grade to show mastery of the end-of-year F.A.S.T. assessment Star Early Literacy, Star Reading, and STAR Math) for reading and math.

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

As a result of utilizing high-yield strategies for our SWD students, we expect 60% of students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th to increase from 39% to 50% and achieve learning gains based on FAST end-of-year results. Additionally, we expect 70% of students in kindergarten through 2nd grade to demonstrate an increase in skills.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Whitney Rumeau (whitney.rumeau@ocps.net)

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.)

The intervention team at Westbrooke will utilize research-based strategies through differentiated centers, support facilitation, push-in, and hourly tutors to implement high-yield strategies such as SIPPS, cooperative learning structures, data-driven PLC's, and cooperative lesson planning to close the achievement gap for our SWD and lowest 25% students. Progress monitoring will occur through formative assessments and adjust instruction as necessary.

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

These strategies were chosen to better respond to the varying needs of students. Multiple measures of data were used to determine students for MTSS tiers, pull-out resource support, support facilitation within the classroom, materials utilized for instruction, and more.

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.

1. Teachers will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to analyze assessment data to drive instruction for individual students.

Person Responsible: Aundrea Keysor (aundrea.keysor@ocps.net)

By When: Mid-September 2023

2. Teachers will choose from a variety of texts and deliberate questioning techniques when planning standards-based lessons and units.

Person Responsible: Vidal Reyes (vidal.reyes@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

Teachers will analyze student performance on SBUA's assessments to determine student progress toward grade-level standards.

Person Responsible: Vidal Reyes (vidal.reyes@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

3. Teachers will determine differentiated activities based on SBUA outcomes. Teachers will consult with interventionists and the MTSS coordinator to implement support facilitation/resource support and tiered instruction.

Person Responsible: Aundrea Keysor (aundrea.keysor@ocps.net)

By When: October

4. Teachers will participate in ongoing professional development related to Cooperative Learning Structures, questioning techniques/stems, and accommodations.

Person Responsible: Aundrea Keysor (aundrea.keysor@ocps.net)

By When: October

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Through team building activities, the ratings on the Panarama Survey in the area of School Leadership will increase from 39% to 60% (teachers) and school climate (students) from 64% to 70%.
Panorama survey results show that in the area of School Leadership, 28% of the teachers rated this area as favorable which is a decrease of 26 points from the previous year. When looking at Panorama Student responses related to School Climate, 35% of students reported having favorable feelings about how the disruption of others impact their learning.

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

As a result of utilizing high-yield community building strategies for our teachers such as: team-building activities on and off campus, celebrations, and Teacher of the Month, and participating in Professional Development in areas of personal interest, the School Leadership rating will increase from 39% to 60%.
As a result of utilizing school-wide P.R.I.D.E procedures which lead to students earning Cat Cash to use at the school store and Student of the Month, we expect School Climate to increase from 64% to 70%.

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

The team at Westbrooke Elementary will utilize Team Building strategies for teachers through Team Building both on and off campus, celebrations, Teacher of the Month, and participating in Professional Development in areas of personal interest we will close the gap for our school staff.
The school staff and teachers will encourage Wild-ly Positive Behavior by reviewing P.R.I.D.E procedures and rewarding students with Cat Cash for demonstrating P.R.I.D.E. Being selected as student of the Month will further enhance behavior excellence.
Progress monitoring will occur quarterly by looking at a decrease in discipline referrals and we will adjust strategies as necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aundrea Keysor (aundrea.keysor@ocps.net)

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.)

Monthly Team Building activities will be planned for staff and Team Building for staff and their families quarterly, monthly celebrations of birthdays and encouraging professional development in areas of personal interest and sharing out with staff.
Evidence-based strategies such as CHAMPS strategies will support increasing how students feel about classroom disruptions through activities such as the Student of the Month celebration and the Wildcat store being open on the last Friday of the month for shopping.

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

These strategies were selected to better respond to the needs the staff expressed via the Panorama survey and during team building activities during pre-planning surrounding School Culture.

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.

Gain feedback from staff related to Team Building Activities they would like to enjoy on our campus.

Person Responsible: Aundrea Keysor (aundrea.keysor@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

Ensure one professional development is dedicated to team building.

Person Responsible: Aundrea Keysor (aundrea.keysor@ocps.net)

By When: October

Roll out the Wildcat store for shopping using earned Cat Cash to support and encourage positive behavior.

Person Responsible: Aundrea Keysor (aundrea.keysor@ocps.net)

By When: September

Student of the Month is nominated and a celebration occurs at the end of each month.

Person Responsible: Aundrea Keysor (aundrea.keysor@ocps.net)

By When: September

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Resource allocations will be directly connected to student achievement. Based on the school's
data we will determine the best programs and services to implement and monitor our plan and continue to visit our plan regularly to make any necessary instructional and/or funding decisions and/or adjustments. Funding is allocated to serve SWD. Small group instruction is provided to increase mastery of content.