

Orange County Public Schools

Westpointe Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Westpointe Elementary

7525 WESTPOINTE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://westpointees.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
Grubbs-Holmes, Atresa	Principal	<p>Dr. Grubbs provides guidance for the school for the use of standard-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 the 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 the team implements joint 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 walkthroughs and providing actionable feedback to staff to improve instructional best practices.</p>
Aprea, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	<p>Mrs. Aprea 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. Mrs. Aprea 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	Attendance/ Social Work	<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 student needs. Ms. Mauvais assists with developing IEPs for students, conducts initial gifted screenings, develops health plans, and coordinates social worker referrals. She provides social skills lessons and ensures students receive mental support as needed. She is also the Threat Assessment lead and the DCF contact. Ms. Mauvais also reviews attendance records, provides attendance documentation letters, and works with our district Social Worker to conduct parent truancy meetings.</p>
Smith, Carol	Staffing Specialist	<p>As a Staffing Specialist, Ms. Smith oversees the implementation of IEPs at Westpointe. She works closely with the ESE Teacher, classroom teachers, school psychologist, and other district support staff by collecting and analyzing student data so that they can make informed decisions. She holds IEP meetings with families, school, and district personnel. She provides behavior support to students and provides guidance and training to staff on ESE policies and procedures.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pagan, Agnes	ELL Compliance Specialist	<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 (ELL). She completes documentation for ELL compliance. Ms. Pagan provides research-based recommendations, interventions, and instruction to ELL teachers.</p> <p>Ms. Pagan also facilitates the MTSS process by meeting with the MTSS team to collaborate on student data to ensure the tiered system of intervention and support 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 support fourth and fifth grade teachers with science instruction in the science lab. Her responsibilities include analyzing mini and unit formative assessments and facilitating PLC. She provides instruction to teachers and students daily on the science standards, in the science lab and in classrooms.</p>
Wesolowski, Rebecca	Other	<p>Ms. Wesolowski supports staff and students on the District Curriculum Technology Learning. She conducts property inventory and coordinates the wellness program. Ms. Wesolowski coordinates the Battle of The Books and Girls On The Run program. She is the Sky Cap alternative for Westpointe Elementary.</p>
Marrero, Olga	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<p>Ms. Marrero serves as our Curriculum Resource Teacher. She provides training to staff members on district and state testing requirements. She ensures all students are given the correct assessments. Ms. Marrero participates in PLC meetings to help discuss how assessment data should be used to drive instruction.</p>

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.

In order to develop our SIP, administrators collaborate with members of the leadership team, as well as team leaders to review data and share ideas on how best to address our areas of need.

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))

Classroom walkthroughs, student common assessments, standard planning minutes, staff feedback, along with parental and community input. Weekly PLC meetings. Weekly review of data and classroom walkthrough data to make instructional changes as needed.

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	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	77%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) 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	10	41	33	29	26	35	0	0	0	174	
One or more suspensions	0	7	2	3	10	12	0	0	0	34	
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	1	42	32	0	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	29	39	0	0	0	69	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	29	40	37	42	0	0	0	0	148	

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	15	16	15	45	36	0	0	0	127

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	43	27	32	42	22	0	0	0	170	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	1	1	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	6	12	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	23	24	0	0	0	50	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	24	25	0	0	0	53	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	2	0	3	22	19	0	0	0	46

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	4	43	27	32	42	22	0	0	0	170	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	1	1	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	6	12	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	23	24	0	0	0	50	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	24	25	0	0	0	53	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	2	0	3	22	19	0	0	0	46

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	11
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*	59	57	53	68	56	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				69			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			83		
Math Achievement*	59	60	59	67	46	50	60		
Math Learning Gains				72			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			74		
Science Achievement*	73	63	54	54	61	59	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	74	59	59	73			74		

* 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
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	64

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	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	25	Yes	4	1
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	67			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	63			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	66			

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	65			
FRL	56			

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	59			59			73					74
SWD	29			21							2	
ELL	56			58			69				5	74
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			45			77				4	
HSP	64			60			76				5	72
MUL	55			73							2	
PAC												
WHT	59			66			65				5	74
FRL	57			50			67				5	77

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	68	69	50	67	72	59	54					73
SWD	25			38								
ELL	69	69	55	69	78	76	51					73
AMI												
ASN												

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	62	68	54	60	68	44	52					
HSP	71	69	48	71	74	72	54					72
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65	67		65	67		47					79
FRL	63	59	35	59	64	50	51					70

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	59	63	83	60	62	74	60					74
SWD	8			31								
ELL	59	65	81	63	75	83	57					74
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	63		48	32		52					
HSP	61	70	85	63	72	93	57					73
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	40		65	67		71					72
FRL	55	62	80	56	60	67	56					68

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	46%	54%	-8%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	52%	-4%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	59%	5%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	62%	-1%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	55%	-15%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	51%	6%

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.

Based on 2022-2023 FAST performance scores, our lowest area was Math, with a 60% passing achievement score. The standards for the 22-23 school year were new. The Scope and Sequence was different from the previous year. Based on Scope and Sequence, there was not much review time at the end of the school year before the assessments.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST performance compared to the 2021-2022 ELA, we dropped from 67% proficiency in Math to 60% proficiency. The standards for the 22-23 school year were new. The Scope and Sequence was different from the previous year. Based on Scope and Sequence, there was not much review time at the end of the school year before the assessments.

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.

All of our data points for FAST ELA (62%), FAST MATH (60%), and FCAT Science (72%), were all above the state average for each assessment. State average FAST ELA (50%), FAST MATH (59%), and FAST Science (51%).

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

SSA Science showed the most improvement with an increase of 18 percentage points from 54% to 72% proficient.

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

Based on EWS data, an area for improvement would be substantial reading deficiency in our K-3 grade levels.

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

- 1) Increase reading proficiency
- 2) Increase in math prerequisite skills

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Including a school-wide behavior plan, we will have staff and students focus on positive choices and consistent expectations in all areas of the school. The choices and expectations will focus on best practices (Dolphins B.E.S.T.) and student resilience. Academic learning is enhanced when students interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The EWS data shows 34 students with one or more suspensions. The goal will be to reduce this number by 20% so that no more than 27 students have one or more suspensions by the end of the year.

Anticipated impact of culture and climate on student achievement- As a result of participating in the school-wide culture and climate activities, at least 75% of our students in 3rd through 5th grade will show learning gains in math as measured by FAST in spring 2024.

Cognia survey data - Eighty-five percent of the teachers and staff will respond favorably in the area of the school climate and culture on the spring Panorama survey.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership team will meet monthly to monitor current students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 for behavior. The team will also review the amount of referrals school-wide each month.

Weekly staff recognition in the Dolphin Squeaks (weekly newsletter).

Monthly Coffee and Conversation with the Principal (open forum for staff to share their thoughts).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Atresa Grubbs-Holmes (atresa.grubbs-holmes@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 school plans to continue to reinforce the implementation of best practices (Dolphins B.E.S.T.) and student resilience throughout the campus.

Our school will monitor and measure the impact of a focus on small group math instruction and enhancing student inventions using programs, such as SuccessMaker.

We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs. We will implement "The Energy Bus Book Study" to support teachers and staff with regards to strengthening the climate and culture school-wide. Throughout the school year, Westpointe will also implement different activities (for students and staff) to increase the culture and climate at Westpointe.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To create desired outcomes with adults and students, it is critical to harness professional skills and leadership capabilities in the school.

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.

Provide professional development to build and establish a school culture for resiliency with adults and students by implementing strategies and resources, including a book study on "The Energy Bus".

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

By When: By the of end the school year.

Provide ongoing professional development for staff to support team dynamics and collaboration. Ensure the transfer from professional development to practice by providing coaching support to teachers on specific strategies and intentional planning during PLC.

Person Responsible: Olga Marrero (olga.marrero@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the school year.

Leadership team will meet monthly to monitor current students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 for behavior. The team will also review the amount of referrals school-wide each month.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Aprea (jennifer.aprea@ocps.net)

By When: on-going

#2. 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.

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. In reviewing the '22-'23 Statewide Assessment data a critical need was determined to be the students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect to have 41% of students with disabilities demonstrate proficiency on the FAST ELA and Math assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership will attend weekly grade-level PLCs to review data and lesson planning. The classroom teachers and the teachers of students with disabilities will analyze data. Specific, targeted lessons will be planned to provide needed differentiation in both ELA and math.

We will analyze the following data:

2022-2023 PMA3

2023-2024 PM1 and PM2

SIPPS

OCPS Common Assessments

Exact Path

Success Maker

Oral Reading Fluency

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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.

We will also: Identify and monitor students in the MTSS, and monitor the use and productivity of Exact Path and SuccessMaker.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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.

The lowest quartile will be identified according to statewide assessment data. Specific areas of need will be addressed during the intervention times for ELA and Math.

Students with disabilities will be monitored the services they receive during support facilitation and direct services.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Aperia (jennifer.apera@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the school year.

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

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

By When: By the end of the school year.

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

Person Responsible: Jennifer Aperia (jennifer.apera@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the school year.

Provide professional development in Professional Learning Communities and monitor the use of the plan.

Person Responsible: Olga Marrero (olga.marrero@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the first nine weeks.

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).

The principal meets collaboratively with staff and parents to assess the needs of students in order to determine allocation of funds.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.
Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.
Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
For Grades 4-5

Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words

Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly

Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.

Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text

Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read

Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text

Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Fifty-five percent of K-2 students will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Fifty-two percent of our 5th-grade students were below Level 3 on the FAST ELA assessment (48% were at Level 3 or above). Based on this data our goal for the 2023-2024 school year is fifty-five percent of will score a Level 3 or higher on the FAST.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators

Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and Cadre leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data, and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Grubbs-Holmes, Atresa, atresa.grubbs-holmes@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators

Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and Cadre leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data, and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Consider that the below use of the above Practice guide strategies meets ESSA strong level of evidence:

- Use of foundational daily practice that will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write/recognize words.
- Use of the comprehension pieces of the optional daily slides (Recommendation 3: Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text)
- Heggerty (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters)
- SIPPS (Recommendation 3: Implement SIPPS program that will develop student skills with decoding words, analyzing word parts, and writing/recognizing words.
- Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; Recommendation 2: Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly; Recommendation 3: Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text)
- OCPS Multisensory Kits (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)
- Exact Path (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; Recommendation 2: Provide purposefully fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly; Recommendation 3: Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text)

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Literacy Leadership Teams</p> <p>Monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Literacy Coaching <p>Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support, etc... to fit area(s) of need. Literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.</p>	
<p>Assessment</p> <p>Use and analysis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -FAST -Heggerty Assessments -District created Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades 2) -DIBELS (K-1) -Being a Reader Formative Data (K-3) -SIPPS Formative Data (K-5) <p>Use of data to determine interventions and support needs of students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Professional Learning <p>Schools develop their professional learning plans based on the needs of their schools. These plans include specific support for teachers based on progress monitoring data. District PD options available include the Instructional Literacy Institute, literacy coach meetings, K-5 ELA Impact Series, Being a Reader PD, SIPPS PD and Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction PD.</p>	<p>Aprea, Jennifer, jennifer.aprea@ocps.net</p>