

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Walker Middle Magnet School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
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

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">31%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">59%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Holloway, Heather	Principal	The principal serves as instructional leader of the school, engages stakeholders in monitoring data, reviewing the SIP goals and creates a collaborative culture where all participate in the decision-making process. The principal ensures SAC is comprised of properly elected representatives, provides leadership in the development, revision, and implementation of the schoolwide improvement plan, submits the SAC-approved SIP to the district for school board approval, and keeps members informed of relevant policies and activities of the school, district, and state.
Corder, Josephine	Magnet Coordinator	Walker's IB Magnet Coordinator serves as an instructional leader and SAC Chair; engages stakeholders and collaborates to ensure the SIP is created using the shared ideas of all stakeholders on campus. She 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. The chair is responsible for notifying members of upcoming meetings and votes. The chair will facilitate the SAC meetings and inform the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities. They also ensure that a quorum is present before an action item on the agenda comes to a vote and works in collaboration with the SAC secretary to ensure minutes are recorded and filed promptly.

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,042

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	354	354	334	0	0	0	0	1042
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	14	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	12	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	20	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/29/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - 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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				81%	51%	54%	83%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	52%	54%	72%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	47%	47%	67%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				86%	55%	58%	87%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				72%	57%	57%	74%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68%	52%	51%	68%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				80%	47%	51%	77%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				87%	67%	72%	90%	66%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	80%	53%	27%	54%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	52%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
08	2021					
	2019	87%	53%	34%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	77%	49%	28%	55%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	87%	62%	25%	54%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
08	2021					
	2019	83%	31%	52%	46%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	81%	47%	34%	48%	33%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	89%	67%	22%	71%	18%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	63%	35%	61%	37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA - Achieve 3000

Math, Science, Civics - District Formative Data

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	57	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	44	47
	Students With Disabilities	64	70	72
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	67.7	72.85	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	55.9	64.01	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	81.55	82.42	N/A
	English Language Learners	55.6	55.8	N/A

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	64	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	51	56
	Students With Disabilities	66	79	82
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	66.5	68.25	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	62.9	62.34	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	77.9	75.97	N/A
	English Language Learners	30.7	75.97	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	63	68.34	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	60.01	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	75.40	83.22	N/A
	English Language Learners	25.2	71.11	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		51	61	65
	Economically Disadvantaged		38	48	53
	Students With Disabilities		63	75	77
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		60.8	50.41	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged		53.9	54.93	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		66.9	56.33	N/A
	English Language Learners		18	30.58	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		73	70.25	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged		63.6	66.27	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		78.6	74.11	N/A
	English Language Learners		36.8	54.74	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	45	53	46	44	46	29	41	54			
ELL	69	71	66	68	61	41	29	83			
ASN	94	82	82	94	73	58	84	93	98		
BLK	72	62	54	72	52	48	37	95	73		
HSP	75	65	52	67	50	41	60	86	77		
MUL	90	75	82	84	54	80	81	88	88		
WHT	82	73	56	80	59	43	75	88	93		
FRL	72	64	53	66	49	40	63	83	81		
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			

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
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	730
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	63
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All subject areas showed a decrease in proficiency, except for Civics. ELA showed overall growth, with 8th grade ELA proficiency slightly declining. Math showed a decrease in the percentage of students who were proficient in all grade levels. 7th grade math has the largest decrease. Additionally, total math gains bottom quartile gains decreased significantly.

- Students with disabilities showed lowest level of proficiency across all subject areas except science.
- ELL students showed low proficiency in science achievement.
- Black students showed low proficiency middle school acceleration and science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

- Math – Bottom Quartile, especially 6th and 7th grade
- Science – ELLs, SWDs, Black students
- Students with Disabilities – All Subject Areas

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

- All - Pandemic/eLearning/Quarantines
- Student/Staff Wellness (in the area of mental health)
- Science – Lack of background knowledge/vocabulary skills
- SWD – Lack of background knowledge/vocabulary skill

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

- ELA
- Civics

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

- Strong PLCs
- Focus on literacy and vocabulary

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

- Build capacity in instructional leaders to create strong PLCs.
- Focus on literacy and vocabulary across the content areas.
- Increase progress monitoring, especially of bottom quartile students.
- Implement small-group teacher-led instruction.
- Focus on home-to-school connection.
- Focus on student and staff wellness.
- Tiered supports in attendance, academics, behavior, and social/emotional wellness.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

- Subject Area Leaders will receive PD on progress monitoring and how to build strong PLCs.
- Teachers will receive PD on teacher-led small group instruction, progress monitoring, literacy strategies, and student wellness.
- Wellness coordinator will regularly communicate staff wellness info to staff members
- Team building activities at each faculty PD.
- Grade Level PLCs will use MTSS to problem-solve tiered supports for students.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

- PTSA supports staff and families in all areas: funding, volunteerism, and student engagement.
- Student clubs are beginning to build again (diminished due to Pandemic)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will address unfinished learning through acceleration, offering grade-level content, progress monitoring and refining learning structures.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percent of students who are proficient in each subject area, in each grade level, by implementing strategically developed small group, teacher led instruction strategies across all curriculums.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring assessments will be analyzed during monthly subject area, same course and grade level PLCs by all teachers. Department Heads (subject area leaders) meet monthly to share the results of the progress monitoring assessments and to share successful strategies used in their department.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group, teacher led instruction in all subject areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	EET data. IB Feedback from IB Feedback from IBO visit. Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Schoolwide differentiated professional development will be conducted to increase effective implementation of small group, teacher led instruction strategies in all subject areas. Grade level RtI (MTSS) will identify struggling students and successful interventions. Same subject PLCs will collaborate using Inquiry Problem Solving Cycle.

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 70% of our striving mathematics and ELA learners (bottom quartile) will make gains on state assessments.

Measurable Outcome: 70% of our striving mathematics and ELA learners (bottom quartile) will make gains on state assessments.

Monitoring: Ongoing progress monitoring through progress monitoring assessments, daily assessment of student work, progress reports, report cards and final results of the 2022 Florida State Assessments.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group, teacher led groups for differentiating instruction. Progress monitoring assessments. Student owned data collection and analysis for goal setting and progress toward standards mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: EET data. IB Feedback from IB Feedback from IBO visit. Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Schoolwide differentiated professional development will be conducted to increase effective implementation of small group, teacher led instruction strategies in all subject areas. Grade level RtI (MTSS) will identify struggling students and successful interventions. Same subject PLCs will collaborate using Inquiry Problem Solving Cycle.

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Literacy and IB Themes: Literacy strategies and IB philosophies will be embedded into all content area</p> <p>In order to increase reading skills, all teachers must implement similar reading strategies into all subject area curriculums.</p> <p>All subject area courses will develop unit plans for all IB MYP teaching. Teachers of the same course must collaborate in the design and reflection of each unit ensuring that all lessons are reflective of the IB MYP philosophies.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Increase the percent of students who are proficient in reading in each grade level by implementing common reading strategies across all curriculums.</p> <p>All subject area courses will develop unit plans for all IB MYP teaching. Teachers of the same course must collaborate in the design and reflection of each unit ensuring that all lessons are reflective of the IB MYP philosophies.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Language and Literature Department Head (Reading & ELA SAL) will lead their department Rtl PLC in reviewing the results of the progress monitoring assessments and the discussion of specific interventions and teaching strategies. All Department Heads (SALs) will monitor the inclusion of reading strategies in all unit plans and lead the PLC discussions for strategies in their specific content area.</p> <p>Teachers will meet as a same course PLC to develop unit plans and upload the unit plans at the end of each semester. Teachers will meet individually as needed with the IB Coordinator</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)</p> <p>Language and Literatue Department Head (Reading & ELA SAL) will provide professional development through Faculty PDs, PLCs and push ins. Support the progress monitoring of level 1 and cusp readers.</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Teachers participate in monthly PLCs as a subject area department and as a same course PLC to collaboratively develop and reflect on unit plans using best practices and embedding the defining features of the IB MYP. The Middle Years Programme Curriculum’s defining features include; conceptual understanding, global contexts, approaches to learning, service as action, inclusion and learning diversity, and STEM education.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>EET data. IB Feedback from IB Feedback from IBO visit. Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org/), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We will work to eliminate violent incidents at Walker. Our school culture and environment will be monitored through our PBIS team and plan, Panorama SEL Survey for students, as well as regular review of our disciplinary data.

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.

Walker Middle Magnet School is an International Baccalaureate World School offering the Middle Years Programme. As an IB school, social and emotional well-being is a priority of both the conceptual design of our curricular program and our way of work. The foundation of the IB program rests upon a learner-centered approach with an inquiry-driven focus, extensive collaboration among students, and involvement with the broader school and local community. With its emphasis on global contexts, the emphasis on community extends to the international community. One of the most significant parts of the IB program, and one that strongly impacts our schools positive culture and environment, is the IB Learner Profile. Made up of ten attributes, the Learner Profile is a shared vocabulary and way of work that is introduced to students from the time they begin the IB program and remains a constant throughout their time with us. Attributes that particularly relate to well-being include balanced, risk-taker, caring, openminded, knowledgeable, and reflective. Remaining true to these principles fosters a safe and happy environment in which young people can learn and a welcoming place for stakeholders to visit.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

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

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