

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Walker Middle Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Walker Middle Magnet School

8282 N MOBLEY RD, Odessa, FL 33556

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Heather Holloway

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Hillsborough 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Walker Middle Magnet School

8282 N MOBLEY RD, Odessa, FL 33556

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Equipping globally minded students to think, collaborate, and act with care.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to take what they have learned and use it to make the world a better place.

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
Holloway, Heather	Principal	<p>Heather Holloway, the principal of Walker Middle Magnet, ensures that the school's mission and vision are carried out. In addition, she plays a role in the progress monitoring of the SIP goal and action steps.</p>
Corder, Josephine	Teacher, K-12	<p>Josephine Corder is Walker's IB Coordinator/Magnet Lead Teacher and serves as the SAC chair, to ensure the SIP is created using the shared ideas of all stakeholders on campus. She also serves the teachers in support of carrying out the SIP goals, action steps and ensures that the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme is implemented in all classes through unit planning, classroom instruction, and school wide programming, and differentiated professional development. As the Science Subject Area Leader, she serves as a resource to teachers in their department in both support of implementing effective classroom strategies and analyzing student data.</p> <p>Walker's APC, Sarah Caldwell, serves as curriculum resource on campus for all stakeholders.</p> <p>Walker's APA, Henry Lefler, ensures the smooth functioning of the facilities, works with grade level discipline referrals and is a participant on the Honor Team, who are responsible for celebrating positive behavior on campus.</p> <p>Elicia McGuinness serves as the AVID coordinator, supporting strategies that encourage academic success for college & career readiness in all classrooms. She provides teachers with differentiated professional development in AVID strategies.</p> <p>Sara LaBarbera, the Media Specialist, works to provide a comprehensive resource for students in the Media Center providing opportunities for research, technology, inquiry, collaboration and new knowledge in an inviting, fun, playful environment.</p> <p>Walker's ESE specialist, ensures that all students are receiving necessary supports in order to be successful in the classroom.</p> <p>The subject-area leaders and elective specialist serve as resources to teachers in their department in both support of implementing effective classroom strategies and analyzing student data.</p> <p>Grade-level team leaders are responsible for organizing the Rtl process on campus to support students working toward proficiency of standards.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Heather Holloway

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.*

6

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	305	372	258	0	0	0	0	935	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	22	28	0	0	0	0	78	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	33	0	0	0	0	59	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17	9	0	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	13	15	0	0	0	0	47	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

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		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	378	309	310	0	0	0	0	997	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	23	28	0	0	0	0	67	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	28	4	0	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	22	23	0	0	0	0	68	

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	7	7	9	0	0	0	0	23

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	378	309	310	0	0	0	0	997	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	23	28	0	0	0	0	67	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	28	4	0	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	22	23	0	0	0	0	68	

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	7	7	9	0	0	0	0	23

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	81%	51%	54%	84%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	52%	54%	71%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	47%	47%	58%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	86%	55%	58%	86%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	72%	57%	57%	74%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	52%	51%	65%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	80%	47%	51%	74%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	67%	72%	91%	66%	70%

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	80%	53%	27%	54%	26%
	2018	85%	52%	33%	52%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	81%	54%	27%	52%	29%
	2018	85%	52%	33%	51%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	87%	53%	34%	56%	31%
	2018	86%	54%	32%	58%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	77%	49%	28%	55%	22%
	2018	82%	48%	34%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	87%	62%	25%	54%	33%
	2018	93%	61%	32%	54%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	83%	31%	52%	46%	37%
	2018	60%	29%	31%	45%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	81%	47%	34%	48%	33%
	2018	77%	48%	29%	50%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	89%	67%	22%	71%	18%
2018	91%	65%	26%	71%	20%
Compare		-2%			
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	98%	63%	35%	61%	37%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	95%	63%	32%	62%	33%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	42	46	43	53	64	56	63	51			
ELL	51	70	63	54	70	60		61			
ASN	95	75	86	97	79	82	95	97	96		
BLK	46	46	48	58	58	49	50	63	83		
HSP	75	61	55	81	70	70	78	80	93		
MUL	90	73		88	67			82	91		
WHT	86	67	65	90	73	72	82	93	96		
FRL	68	57	55	75	68	63	70	76	85		
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	40	50	63	49	43	40	50	55			
ELL	63	66	62	61	56	43	54	82	83		
ASN	95	82	84	99	92	93	89	100	100		
BLK	63	59	52	75	61	70	73	73	87		
HSP	77	67	63	81	69	64	70	85	90		
MUL	90	71	80	95	86	93	87		100		
PAC	70	50		70	70						
WHT	86	75	72	89	73	64	78	93	93		
FRL	73	67	67	80	68	66	66	81	89		
2017 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	27	32	32	32	51	47	31	70			
ELL	53	50	55	64	67	54	17	85			
ASN	91	82	80	96	80	68	74	98	97		
BLK	69	60	53	62	68	54	50	88	81		
HSP	79	68	54	83	72	64	61	89	87		
MUL	93	76		93	66			100			

2017 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
PAC	73	82		91	91						
WHT	86	71	57	88	75	68	85	91	92		
FRL	70	65	51	73	68	57	57	83	83		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	92
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	785
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	89
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	76
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	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	80
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	72
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.

ELA bottom quartile and learning gains showed the lowest performance especially among our students with disabilities and black students. This is a trend over the last few years.

Contributing factors could be any of the following:

Structural:

A/C issues

Instructional:

Lack of focused reading strategies school-wide

Positive relationship with the teacher

Learning with tech vs. no tech

Differentiation in the classroom

Varying instructional materials

Mentors

Additional support in classrooms

Non-instructional:

New teacher

Attendance

Resources available to families at home

Late buses

Behavior

Cultural:

Home life

Family involvement

Clubs

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

ELA bottom quartile and learning gains showed the greatest decline especially among our students with disabilities and black students. This is a trend over the last few years.

Contributing factors could be any of the following:

Structural:

A/C issues

Instructional:

Lack of focused reading strategies school-wide

Positive relationship with the teacher

Learning with tech vs. no tech

Differentiation in the classroom

Varying instructional materials

Mentors

Additional support in classrooms

Non-instructional:

New teacher

Attendance

Resources available to families at home

Late buses
Behavior

Cultural:
Home life
Family involvement
Clubs

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 school to state gaps were in the positive. Science SSA achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state by 29 percent. Possible contributing factors include:

Only 8th grade students took the test. 8th grade had the highest overall achievement on the ELA, FSA with a passing percentage of 87%, 6% greater than 7th and 7% greater than 6th grade. The SSA requires students to read on grade level, so it would seem that students reading and scoring at the proScient level for reading can understand the concepts and vocabulary in the questions.

Other possible factors include:

Structural:
A/C issues

Instructional:
Lack of focused reading strategies school-wide
Positive relationship with the teacher
Learning with tech vs. no tech
Differentiation in the classroom
Varying instructional materials
Mentors
Additional support in classrooms

Non-instructional:
New teacher
Attendance
Resources available to families at home
Late buses
Behavior

Cultural:
Home life
Family involvement
Clubs

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

8th grade Math showed the most improvement with a 23% increase from the previous year. Members of the Math department strategically pulled students from lunch for targeted standards-based remediation. Other possible factors may include the following:

Instructional:
Positive relationship with the teacher

Learning with tech vs. no tech
Differentiation in the classroom
Varying instructional materials
Mentors

Non-instructional:
New teacher
Attendance
Resources available to families at home
Late buses- scheduling of students
Behavior

Cultural:
Home life
Family involvement
Clubs

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

7th grade course failures in ELA and Math are a point of focus. 7th grade is a transitional year for students and these students may need additional support both at school and at home. Increasing communication lines with struggling students may be a solution.

The number of students scoring a Level 1 on statewide assessments has increased and the school will utilize AVID and literacy strategies to address the needs of these students in all classes.

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

1. Literacy across curriculum
2. Student led progress monitoring
3. Using various data points to gain knowledge of students
4. Providing valuable feedback to teachers
5. Differentiated on-site professional development related to IB MYP and AVID college & career readiness skills

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Implementing Reading Strategies Across the Curriculum
Description and Rationale:	In order to increase reading skills, all teachers must implement similar reading strategies into all curriculums.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percent of students who are proficient in reading (in each grade level) by implementing common reading strategies across all curriculums.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading Coach will: 1) provide professional development through Faculty PDs, PLCs, and push ins. 2) support the progress monitoring process for level 1, level 2 and cusp readers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Criteria used to make this determination: 1) EET data 2) IB Feedback from IB Organization visit 3) Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Description:

- 1) School-wide differentiated professional development will be conducted to increase effective implementation of cross-curricular reading strategies.
- 2) Grade-level RtI (MTSS) will identify struggling readers and successful interventions.
- 3) Same-subject PLCs will collaborate using Inquiry/Problem-Solving Cycle.

Person Responsible Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Title: Implement Student-Led Progress Monitoring Rationale: In order to further engage students in their learning, they will learn to monitor their progress toward standard mastery.
Measurable Outcome:	All students will participate in the monitoring of their progress toward standard mastery.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1) EET data 2) IB Feedback from IB Organization visit 3) Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Criteria used to make this determination: 1) EET data 2) IB Feedback from IB Organization visit 3) Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.
Action Steps to Implement	
1) School-wide differentiated professional development will be conducted to increase effective implementation of student-led progress monitoring. 2) ILT will collaborate to identify how to approach student-led progress monitoring with subject areas. 3) Same-subject PLCs will identify a process by which students will monitor progress toward standard mastery and problem-solve using an Inquiry Cycle.	
Person Responsible	Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Using data to gain knowledge of all students.

Description and Rationale: In order to design effective IB unit planners, teachers must first know and understand their students' needs. Effective unit planners differentiate the learning to create an opportunity for all students to master the standards and constantly assess for understanding and make changes when necessary to promote increased student achievement for all.

Measurable Outcome: Increasing the use of student assessment data (formative, summative, disciplinary, and social/emotional) to drive effective IB unit planning will increase standards mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- 1) EET data
- 2) IB Feedback from IB Organization visit
- 3) Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Criteria used to make this determination:

- 1) EET data
- 2) IB Feedback from IB Organization visit
- 3) Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide Differentiated Professional Development to increase effective and highly effective unit planning
2. Grade-level RTI to identify struggling students and successful interventions to support them
3. Same -subject PLC's to promote collaboration of teachers from the same subject area using the Inquiry Cycle
4. PSLT meets to discuss support for grade level teams
5. ILT meets to discuss support for same-subject PLCs

Person Responsible Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

7th grade course failures in ELA and Math are a point of focus. 7th grade is a transitional year for students and these students may need additional support both at school and at home. Increasing communication lines with struggling students may be a solution.

- 1) engage students in self progress monitoring**
- 2) use of AVID organizational strategies**
- 3) increased communication with the student and parent**
- 4) parent & family engagement in literacy and math events that include strategies for home support**

The number of students scoring a Level 1 on statewide assessments has increased and the school will utilize AVID and literacy strategies to address the needs of these students in all classes.

- 1) engage students in self progress monitoring**
- 2) use of AVID organizational strategies**
- 3) increased communication with the student and parent**
- 4) parent & family engagement in literacy and math events that include strategies for home support**

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.

Walker's SAC ensures the involvement of the community and best practices to meet student needs and provide the appropriate supports.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00