Webb Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Webb Middle School

6035 HANLEY RD, Tampa, FL 33634

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Glenda Vinueza

Start Date for this Principal: 5/24/2015

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 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

Webb Middle School

6035 HANLEY RD, Tampa, FL 33634

[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	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	B

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.

To educate students for a better future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life: Everybody, Everyday, No Excuses!

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
Diaz, Frank	Principal	Instructional leader for Webb Middle School. As a group, the leadership team facilitates professional learning communities (PLCs), professional development, parent/teacher conferences, RTI/MTSS process, review and support high quality instructional practices and intervention/enrichment, review on-going progress monitoring data, communicates school-wide data and facilitates problem solving.
Roberts, Anita	Assistant Principal	Share discipline responsibility, develop and execute master schedule, monitor and adjust for student curriculum needs, and monitor and maintain facilities.
Rizzi, Sandra	School Counselor	Provide academic and social guidance, support teachers, assist with scheduling and testing.
Tumelty, Denise	Instructional Coach	Provide academic support to teachers, students and administration in the content area of mathematics.
Koester, Susan	Instructional Coach	Provide academic support to teachers, students and administration in the content area of reading.
JeanBaptiste, Daryl	Instructional Coach	Provide academic support to teachers, students and administration in the content area of writing.
Alvarez, Jessica	Attendance/ Social Work	Connects students and parents with social services and material aid; coordinates support with guidance, teachers and administration.
Daigle, David	Assistant Principal	Share discipline responsibility, develop and execute master schedule, monitor and adjust for student curriculum needs, and monitor and maintain facilities.
Garcia, Heylen	School Counselor	Provide academic and social guidance, support teachers, assist with scheduling and testing.
Cainas, Isis	Teacher, ESE	Oversees the ESE department: teachers, paperwork, student instructional needs, IEPs

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 5/24/2015, Glenda Vinueza

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.*

50

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	269	267	249	0	0	0	0	785
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	114	83	0	0	0	0	309
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	77	58	47	0	0	0	0	182
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	63	43	0	0	0	0	180

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	4	5	2	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
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	244	258	258	0	0	0	0	760
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	33	36	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	37	34	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	37	42	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	62	74	0	0	0	0	197

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	43	54	64	0	0	0	0	161

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	244	258	258	0	0	0	0	760
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	33	36	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	37	34	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	37	42	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	62	74	0	0	0	0	197

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	43	54	64	0	0	0	0	161

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
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	50%	51%	54%	45%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	52%	54%	59%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	47%	47%	52%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	59%	55%	58%	55%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	57%	65%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	49%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	47%	51%	44%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	67%	72%	60%	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	47%	53%	-6%	54%	-7%
	2018	39%	52%	-13%	52%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	54%	-6%	52%	-4%
	2018	41%	52%	-11%	51%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	47%	53%	-6%	56%	-9%
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	58%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	49%	49%	0%	55%	-6%
	2018	40%	48%	-8%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
	2018	52%	61%	-9%	54%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	37%	31%	6%	46%	-9%
	2018	31%	29%	2%	45%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	44%	47%	-3%	48%	-4%
	2018	34%	48%	-14%	50%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	62%	67%	-5%	71%	-9%
2018	50%	65%	-15%	71%	-21%
Compare		12%			
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	94%	63%	31%	61%	33%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	84%	63%	21%	62%	22%
Compare		10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%

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	17	38	35	28	55	42	14	38	42		
ELL	31	59	60	38	64	58	28	47	70		
ASN	70										
BLK	49	59	64	55	61	46	44	75			
HSP	50	57	53	58	69	58	41	67	72		
MUL	48	58		74	73		58				
WHT	49	60	47	58	61	57	57	70	59		
FRL	49	57	55	58	69	59	44	69	69		
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	14	36	36	18	39	43	8	26			
ELL	26	54	55	40	52	52	20	31	68		
ASN	69	69		92	54						
BLK	38	42		40	41	27	21	43			
HSP	45	54	50	50	55	47	34	54	70		
MUL	40	52		50	61						
WHT	47	58	62	59	58	63	52	68	75		
FRL	44	53	50	51	54	48	33	54	68		
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	9	41	44	20	44	32	15	27			
ELL	25	52	46	40	61	49	18	53	83		
ASN	75	77		92	69						
BLK	47	67	64	52	60		23	62	70		
HSP	42	57	49	52	63	46	41	57	85		
MUL	48	68		45	76						
WHT	52	63	75	68	76	65	66	71	79		
FRL	43	57	50	55	65	48	43	58	86		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	597
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
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	70
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	57
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	59
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	62
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	58
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	60
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 that showed the lowest performance is ELA/learning gains for the lowest 25% - 4% growth (from 50% to 54%). The growth is a good indicator that our students who struggle the most are making gains and that growth in this data component takes time.

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

There was not a decline in any of the data components.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math, Learning Gains. The gap is 11% (Webb Middle - 68%; State - 57%). A huge factor is access to IXL for all math students. IXL provided targeted, adapted standards practice that allowed students to work at their pace with problems adjusted for their responses. Small group pull outs for struggling math students during the second semester also contributed to the gap as well as two new intensive math teachers this year.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement are math/learning gains (54% to 68%) and social studies/civics (55% to 69%), which both posted 14% growth. Using the IXL program schoolwide during the 4th quarter provided targeted practice for students that impacted student learning. New teachers in Intensive Math and Civics greatly influenced student learning as well.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, two areas of concern are "course failure in ELA or Math" and "2 or more indicators". Both areas increased each year with the highest number in the 8th grade year. The numbers on those categories should decrease rather than increase. We must provide supports at each grade level and strategically support the students identified in the 6th grade.

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

1. ELA/Learning Gains
2. Math/Learning Gains
3. ELA/Learning Gains, lowest 25%
4. Civics
5. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher practice will show evidence of preparation for the students they teach. Teacher preparation will include: 1) starting with the standards they teach; 2) using academic language; 3) referencing knowledge of their students and their needs (ELL, ESE, "regular"). When these component are present, our students will learn. Students with disabilities will particularly benefit from lessons designed to address their accommodations and that support their IEP goals.
Measurable Outcome:	The measureable outcome will be visible through practice based on standards that are executed in classrooms.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence of well-designed lessons will be observed in practice during walkthroughs, formal and informal.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be offered a framework for components of an effective lesson: 1) review of previous day's lesson with students; 2) objectives; 3) standards based (literacy and content standards); 4) checks for understanding; 5) H.O.T. (higher order thinking) questions/ academic talk; and, 6) scaffolding (I do - we do - you do). When teachers are observed, these components should be evident.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Academic coaches will provide professional development to support the needs of teachers.
2. Webb administration will conduct walk-throughs.
3. Webb administration and academic coaches will meet weekly to discuss the needs of the school.
4. Webb administration will provide specific and timely feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible   Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers in all content areas will focus on literacy to enhance student learning. By including academic vocabulary and writing across curriculum in all classes, students will make connections and enhance their learning in all areas. This will be especially true of students with disabilities who need a variety of entry points into standards as well as consistency and repetition.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome is evidence of literacy components in student writing and in use of academic vocabulary during observations/walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Instructional Leadership Team will develop school-wide activities to promote literacy to teachers and students. These activities will complement literacy efforts by teachers in their classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By using the Instructional Leadership Team for school-wide literacy activities, students will connect the literacy components of their class lessons with the school-wide literacy activities and this will enhance their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Academic coaches will present literacy components to teachers during pre-planning.
2. Academic coaches will support the implementation of literacy components.
3. Academic coaches and the Instructional Leadership Team will provide professional development opportunities involving literacy throughout the year.
4. Webb administration will monitor instruction for evidence of literacy inclusion.

Person Responsible	Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

To ensure efficient/systematic allocation and use of resources, the Leadership/PSLT utilizes an RtI/
MTSS framework to improve learning for all. Resources allocated support academic and behavioral supports, ensuring all students have access to instruction.
To ensure all needs are met, the PSLT:
Reviews school-wide data on an ongoing basis, identifying instructional needs across the school; Reviews progress monitoring data of core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s); Communicates school-wide data to PLCs, facilitating problem solving within the content/grade level teams.
The PSLT meets regularly (bi-weekly/monthly). Team members include administrator(s), guidance counselor(s), school psychologist, academic coaches/specialists, PLC teacher liaisons, others as needed.
PBIS is also used to support positive behaviors in and out of the classroom through spider dollars, positive celebrations that are earned, a PBIS room - all student lead to create an engaging and positive climate at our school for students and staff within the school day.

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.

Parent involvement makes a huge difference in student learning. We will invite and involve parents in the School Advisory Council, Family and Parent activities, content nights, Parent, Teacher, Student Association, Canvas (online learning, grade, and communication platform) and text and email communications. We will begin our outreach at Open House before school starts and continue throughout the school year.

Community members will be involved on our School Advisory Council (SAC) to actively help implement our School-wide Improvement Plan. The community will be invited to participate in activities that highlight programs at Webb Middle as well as programs available at our feeder schools, such as: Elementary Day in the Webb (Semester 1) and Junior Achievement Career Fair (November), Family Engagement dinner and Webb Parent University (Spring 2021).

Indoctrinating new teachers is important to keeping these teachers at our school and on our team. All new teachers have been assigned a "buddy teacher" who will guide them through the written and unwritten culture of our school. This will help teachers feel comfortable and confident in meeting the needs of their students.

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: Differentiation**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**