Orange County Public Schools

Westridge Middle

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Westridge Middle

3800 W OAK RIDGE RD, Orlando, FL 32809

https://westridgems.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Dennis Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gonzalez, Dennis	Principal	Mr. Gonzalez will monitor the roles and responsibilities of all staff members in order to ensure appropriate implementation of and adherence to the school improvement plan areas of focus. As a result of an analysis of school-grade data components, Mr. Gonzalez will progress monitor school-wide student learning and teacher effectiveness related to identified Areas of Focus.
	Assistant Principal	Mr. Longhouse will monitor student learning trends in all content areas through an active adoption of academic and academic systems within the multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) framework. Mr. Longhouse will progress monitor student learning and teacher effectiveness in the seventh grade.
Haan, Destiny	Assistant Principal	Ms. Haan will monitor student engagement and student discipline through an active adoption of behavioral and academic systems within the multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) framework. Ms. Haan will progress monitor student learning and teacher effectiveness in the sixth grade.
Harper, Sarah	Instructional Coach	Ms. Harper will support all teachers with an intense focus on pedagogical practice. Ms. Harper will specifically focus support with lesson-planning, data-analysis, differentiation of instruction, collaborative learning structures, and student engagement strategies with first and second year teachers. Ms. Harper will be responsible for monitoring and supporting student achievement and learning gains in english language arts.
Vitulli, Emilio	Assistant Principal	Mr. Vitulli will monitor student engagement and student-discipline through an active adoption of behavioral and academic systems within the multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) framework. Mr. Vitulli will progress monitor student learning and teacher effectiveness in the eighth grade.
Schneider, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Ms. Schneider will specifically support science and Civics teachers with an intense focus on pedagogical practice, lesson-planning, data-analysis, differentiation of instruction, collaborative learning structures, and student engagement strategies. Ms. Schneider will be responsible for student achievement in Civics and science.
Vanmali, Rajni	Instructional Coach	Ms. Vanmali will specifically support mathematics teachers with an intense focus on pedagogical practice, lesson-planning, data-analysis, differentiation of instruction, collaborative learning structures, and student engagement strategies. Ms. Vanmali will be responsible for monitoring and supporting student achievement and learning gains in mathematics.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Scott, Stephen	Instructional Coach	Mr. Scott will specifically support ELA/Reading teachers with an intense focus on pedagogical practice, lesson-planning, data-analysis, differentiation of instruction, collaborative learning structures, and student engagement strategies. Mr. Scott will be responsible for monitoring and supporting student achievement and learning gains in ELA.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/9/2020, Dennis Gonzalez

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students

School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	449	404	415	0	0	0	0	1268
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	60	70	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	25	44	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	152	106	0	0	0	0	328
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	103	96	0	0	0	0	270
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	128	119	0	0	0	0	356
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	140	128	0	0	0	0	384

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	171	161	0	0	0	0	467

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/16/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	471	460	449	0	0	0	0	1380
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	87	102	0	0	0	0	249
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27	47	0	0	0	0	94
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	255	121	213	0	0	0	0	589
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	213	301	244	0	0	0	0	758

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	166	153	182	0	0	0	0	501

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	471	460	449	0	0	0	0	1380
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	87	102	0	0	0	0	249
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27	47	0	0	0	0	94
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	255	121	213	0	0	0	0	589
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	213	301	244	0	0	0	0	758

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	166	153	182	0	0	0	0	501

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	31%	52%	54%	31%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	52%	54%	37%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	45%	47%	34%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	35%	55%	58%	30%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	45%	55%	57%	36%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	50%	51%	34%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	51%	51%	33%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	43%	67%	72%	56%	68%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	33%	52%	-19%	54%	-21%
	2018	25%	48%	-23%	52%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	21%	48%	-27%	52%	-31%
	2018	27%	48%	-21%	51%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	29%	54%	-25%	56%	-27%
	2018	28%	55%	-27%	58%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	33%	43%	-10%	55%	-22%
	2018	15%	35%	-20%	52%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	19%	49%	-30%	54%	-35%
	2018	28%	51%	-23%	54%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	17%	36%	-19%	46%	-29%
	2018	5%	32%	-27%	45%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	25%	49%	-24%	48%	-23%
	2018	28%	49%	-21%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	39%	66%	-27%	71%	-32%
2018	49%	66%	-17%	71%	-22%
Compare		-10%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	84%	63%	21%	61%	23%
2018	59%	61%	-2%	62%	-3%
Compare		25%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	91%	53%	38%	57%	34%
2018	83%	65%	18%	56%	27%
Compare		8%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	6	27	22	12	36	39	16	13			
ELL	20	39	39	28	40	42	16	30	76		
ASN	63	58		74	58				100		
BLK	32	43	36	33	43	45	27	43	80		
HSP	28	41	42	35	46	45	27	40	81		
WHT	37	38		41	54						
FRL	30	42	43	35	45	50	29	43	78		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	5	15	18	12	27	24	3	22			
ELL	13	31	32	16	26	29	15	39	57		
ASN	67	43		62	57				82		
BLK	29	38	36	28	34	37	28	59	57		
HSP	30	35	31	29	35	31	36	53	66		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
WHT	35	31		47	53						
FRL	30	37	35	29	34	34	34	57	61		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

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

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	43
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 with the lowest performance was Science Achievement at 29%. Following a six point increase in the 2017-2018 school year, achievement levels dropped

four points. The leading factor contributing to this performance is teacher turnover and inconsistency on the 8th grade science team. One teacher from the 2017-2018 school year returned to 8th grade science and resigned half-way through the 2018-2019 school year.

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

Social Studies Achievement declined from 56% to 43%. Achievement in Social Studies had trended positively over the previous three school years, showing an aggregate increase of 14 points. Teacher turnover and a team of teachers new to the content area likely contributed to the decrease in performance during the 2018-2019 school year.

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

Social Studies Achievement had a gap of 29% when compared to the state average. Teacher turnover and a team of teachers new to the content area likely contributed to the gap when compared to the state average for the 2018-2019 school year.

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

Math Lowest 25% had an increase of 12% from the prior year. A new mathematics coach was hired to support teacher development. Additionally, sections of intensive mathematics were reintroduced as an intervention course for students struggling in mathematics. All intensive mathematics classes were blocked purposefully with their corresponding grade-level mathematics class and instructed by the same teacher.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two areas of concern is the performance of these two subgroups: Students with Disabilities, 23%; ELL, 38%.

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

1. Math Learning Gains
2. Math LG Low 25
3. ELA Learning Gains
4. ELA LG Low 25
5. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will be focusing on more students achieving learning gains in math as compared to student outcomes in 2018-2019. A "learning gain" is meant to approximate (at least) 1 year's worth of academic growth. Students of all abilities should make at least 1 year of growth in order to close learning gaps for students who are behind their same-aged peers, and prevent learning gaps from occurring for students who are at or above grade level. Math learning gains was identified as a critical need as a focus on this component will impact all students. In order to maximize efficacy of instruction and interventions, we will target subgroups of students with specific interventions. For example, students in the lowest 25% will be closely monitored and interventions and supports continually layered in as progress monitoring dictates. At the same time, we need to ensure that our high-performing students also make learning gains and continue to achieve at a high level, so will progress monitor them with targets commensurate to the corresponding FSA level needed to ensure a learning gain. We have two subgroups below 41% in the ESSA Federal Index for 2018-2019: Students with Disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELL). In progress monitoring math, and examining supports, services, and interventions, we will look carefully on a student by student basis to ensure that students in these ESSA-identified subgroups are making adequate progress and closing achievement gaps.
Measureable Outcome:	Our target is to move math learning gains on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) from 45% in 2018-2019 to 62% in 2020-2021. By moving overall learning gains to 62%, we will see a substantial increase in learning gains of the lowest 25% (previously 46%), SWD (previously 36%), and ELL (previously 40%).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dennis Gonzalez (dennis.gonzalez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To achieve an increase in learning gains of 17% in math, we will reconfigure the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and tutoring options available to students. All students in the lowest 25%, as well as all students in the SWD and ELL subgroups will be invited to math tutoring. In order to accommodate the needs of students, teachers, and families, we will offer an array of tutoring opportunities which include: zero period (morning) tutoring, after-school tutoring, Saturday School, and virtual (distance) tutoring. In addition to tutoring, our MTSS process will progress monitor and analyze data to layer in supports for students during the school day. For example, students may be placed in a second "reading" or "math" class, or may receive an increased amount of small-group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has consistently shown that well-designed tutoring programs can be effective in improving children's academic skills. By increasing the frequency and duration that students, particularly students in lowest 25% and SWD/ELL subgroups, are engaged in small-group instruction with highly qualified teachers, we will likely see a corresponding increase in student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Invite, schedule, and track attendance of tutoring students (largely comprised of Low 25%, SWD, ELL).

Person Responsible Stephen Scott (stephen.scott@ocps.net)

Progress monitor all math students based on common assessment data and i-Ready diagnostics, with particular emphasis on Low 25%, SWD, and ELL

Person Responsible Rajni Vanmali (rajni.vanmali@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: academic performance of our ESE and ELL subgroups, and learning gains of all students in math.
Measureable Outcome:	As a result of increased student proficiency with respect to SEL competencies, we will see a corresponding increase in the math achievement of students. An improved culture and climate will play a contributing factor in the expected 17 point increase in math learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dennis Gonzalez (dennis.gonzalez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement	
Understand the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional strategies.	
Person Responsible	Dennis Gonzalez (dennis.gonzalez@ocps.net)
Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.	

Person Responsible	Dennis Gonzalez (dennis.gonzalez@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Increasing the academic achievement of SWD and ELL is a priority. We are providing increased support and academic rigor to ESE and ELL programs, as well as progress monitoring, and layering in interventions as needed to ensure academic progress is made.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We value the input and experience of all stakeholders, both internal and external to Westridge MS. As such, we proactively seek out partnerships within the community and invite them to join us for events and to participate within School Advisory Council (SAC).

We also survey our internal stakeholders (teachers, parents, families) throughout the year to ensure that we are identifying areas of growth and meeting the academic, social, cultural, and social emotional needs of everyone.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**