Webb Middle School

2021-22 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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 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%)
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

Webb Middle School

6035 HANLEY RD, Tampa, FL 33634

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	84%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Diaz, Frank	Principal	Principal of Webb Middle
Roberts, Anita	Assistant Principal	APC and testing coordinator
Garcia, Heylen	School Counselor	Guidance counselor
Cainas, Isis	Teacher, ESE	ESE specialist and case manager
JeanBaptiste, Daryl	Instructional Coach	Writing Coach
Koester, Susan	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach
Lum, Alyssa	SAC Member	SAC Chair, SAL of ELA
Tumelty, Denise	Instructional Coach	Math Coach and SAL
Daigle, David	Assistant Principal	AP of discipline and sports
Barfield-Craig, Katherine	Attendance/Social Work	Social work and attendance tracker (ACEs)
Bonfonte, Lenor	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL and testing specialist
Kratochvil, Natalie	Psychologist	Psychologist for students and families
Rivera, Marlene	Behavior Specialist	ABCs with areas in SEL and behavior
Beck, Meagan	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor

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.*
3

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

756

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	229	281	249	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	14
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	10	11	0	0	0	0	31
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 8/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	

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				50%	51%	54%	45%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	52%	54%	53%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	47%	47%	50%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				59%	55%	58%	51%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				68%	57%	57%	54%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	52%	51%	47%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				44%	47%	51%	37%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				69%	67%	72%	55%	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	47%	53%	-6%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	52%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2021					
	2019	47%	53%	-6%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	55%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2021					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
08	2021					
	2019	37%	31%	6%	46%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2021					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	48%	-4%
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	62%	67%	-5%	71%	-9%
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	94%	63%	31%	61%	33%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

FALL:
Science- 8th grade Baseline
Civics- Baseline test
6-8 ELA - Achieve 3000 levelset, Baseline Writing, Baseline Reading, NewsELA (Level 1 & 2)
6-8 Math - iXL diagnostic, Baseline Assessments

Winter:
Science- MidYear Science Assessment
Civics- Quarter Benchmarks, Midyear Assessment
6-8 ELA- Midyear Reading, Midyear Writing, Achieve 3000 Midyear levelset
6-8 Math- Midyear Assessments

Spring-
Science-
Civics-
6-8 ELA- Pre-FSA Writing
6-8 Math-

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11.31	13.85	18.39
	Economically Disadvantaged	10.33	12.46	16.33
	Students With Disabilities	14.89	12.72	18.18
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43.5	52.94	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.5	52.11	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	33.15	53.77	N/A
	English Language Learners	36.5	64.05	N/A

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14.28	19.85	23.22
	Economically Disadvantaged	14.52	20.63	23.87
	Students With Disabilities	17.4	22.92	22.92
	English Language Learners	0	0	21.21
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46.2	49.25	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	46.2	49.02	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	30.7	68.25	N/A
	English Language Learners	25.1	68.25	N/A
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40.7	40.8	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.7	37.5	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	22.85	30.9	N/A
	English Language Learners	25.2	24.1	N/A

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23.01	28.46	34.63
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.5	26.89	32.78
	Students With Disabilities	24.33	33.33	35.9
	English Language Learners	6.25	5	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53.9	46.15	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	57.35	40.99	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	52.8	42.98	N/A
	English Language Learners	43.4	53.56	N/A
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	57.51	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.6	63.56	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	66.85	54.24	N/A
	English Language Learners	12.15	27.93	N/A

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	9	24	21	10	27	35	4	21			
ELL	25	45	46	28	41	51	26	41	60		
BLK	33	34	24	18	35	45	31	43	54		
HSP	36	44	39	35	36	48	39	54	66		
MUL	35	27		44	36						
WHT	43	37	36	37	33	50	37	47	58		
FRL	36	41	36	33	34	48	38	51	65		
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										

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
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		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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	44
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?

The trends across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas showed a decrease in student success in all areas from achievement to learning gains across the board.

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

The data components which need the greatest improvement are the learning gains specifically in ELA and Math.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement is mostly due to our student population. We have a high ELL and ESE population which the pandemic exacerbated the learning of many of our students. To increase ELA learning gains, the ELA/Reading department will address the following in PLCs throughout the year: 1) focus on planning with ELA & reading by grade level in order to incorporate specific acceleration strategies. 2. Based on past data; reading will focus on Key Ideas & Details, while ELA will focus on Integration of Knowledge & Ideas. 3. Small group pull outs/push ins. To increase Math learning gains, the Math department will address the following in PLC's: 1) focus on planning by grade level and incorporate thinking maps (flow chart, circle map, and or tree map). 2)Focusing on the strands by grade level that have the biggest deficit. 3) using baseline data, based on math course taught, teachers will use progress monitoring assessments created by the district to identify individual students' unfinished learning. They will monitor student progress through mini-lessons.

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

Our data showed no improvement from 2019.

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

Our data showed no improvement from 2019.

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

Strategies that need to be implemented to accelerate learning are ones that will promote literacy in all classrooms. We will work to implement school-wide metacognitive markers (reading strategy) and

Because, But, So (writing strategy) throughout all content areas. Also, teachers while collaboratively planning, will use continuous progress monitoring of students to utilize small group instruction in the classroom to address any gaps in student learning.

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.

Professional development will focus on driving engagement (a follow up to lesson planning last year), small group instruction in the classroom, and acceleration strategies for all students.

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

Instructional coaches will conduct walk throughs to obtain data to drive professional development for our teachers. Our focus will be on the different areas of engagement and assisting teachers in increasing engagement in classrooms.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve the quality of teacher collaboration with a focus on lesson preparation, standards, assessments, and academic engagement.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome will be visible through practice based on standards, student needs, curriculum that are executed in classrooms.
Monitoring:	In PLCs, teachers will collaborate and plan weekly by grade level/curriculum to create and reflect on the implementation of content.
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

PLCs utilize time to collaborate with peers to ensure that student needs are met, strategies are used to accelerate learning and data and standards drive instructional outcomes.

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

Through academic walkthroughs, admin and coaches will see evidence of teacher's collaborative planning and student engagement.

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

Reflect based on what we see to support and create professional development catered toward teacher needs.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the quality of literacy instruction by including reading and writing strategies across all content areas
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome is evidence of literacy components in student writing and in use of academic vocabulary during observations/walkthroughs.
Monitoring:	Reading and Writing coach will be utilizing small groups and push-ins to assist our students who need further help. There will be a focus on our Level 1 and Level 2 students, ELL and ESE student population.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading- Metacognitive Markers for text-marking Writing-Because, But, So strategy
Rationale for 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.

Action Steps to Implement	
Meet with Core team to discuss ideas to bring to ILT team to implement strategies schoolwide	
Person Responsible	Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)
Meet with ILT team to discuss literacy strategies to use schoolwide and how to implement these strategies through PLCs	
Person Responsible	Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)
Provide trainings in PLCs on the literacy strategies	
Person Responsible	Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)
Monitor the use of the strategies school wide in various content areas and provide supports to teachers as needed	
Person Responsible	Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student Services will collaborate with teachers in identifying social-emotional learning strategies that can be implemented in the classroom.
Measurable Outcome:	We will use our discipline data to observe a decrease in negative student behaviors and adjust our target student behaviors as needed through our PBIS and Success Team.
Monitoring:	With our success team and PBIS team, we have identified Targeted Behaviors for our students through our WEBB Code: Work hard, Encourage success, Be prepared, Be respectful. We will use SEL lessons in the classroom weekly to provide student's the opportunity to learn social and emotional awareness. We are also transitioning to the use of Hero K-12, a program designed to award students points for targeted behaviors so that they can earn incentives at school
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SEL Lessons with emphasis on collaborative academic talk with interactive lessons
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students, more than anything, need an opportunity to talk about how they feel. They need time to process their emotions in a safe space so they become more communicative rather than reactive. These strategies will help them to develop the skills needed to express themselves in a positive way rather than a negative reaction.

Action Steps to Implement

PBIS/Success team plan

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

Implementation of positive behavior incentives

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

Implementation of SEL lessons in the classroom with monitored progress

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

Monitoring of student behaviors on discipline data and adjust plan and actions as needed

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

A primary area of concern for our school to monitor during this school year is to decrease the amount of suspensions to increase our student's academic success. We have talked a lot with our Success team and PBIS team about preventative measures to help mitigate the issues between students that arise on campus. We are implementing many positive behavior incentives (Spider Dollars, School Store, Spider's Den, Positive Referrals and Celebrations) but in the classroom we are implementing SEL strategies to help students learn how to express their emotions rather than becoming reactive to a problem. Our Success Coach with also be meeting weekly with students on her caseload to provide extra supports for our students with indicators. Our students need support in developing emotional maturity which we hope the use of SEL lessons in our classrooms will help teach them how to overcome problems. This will be monitored quarterly through our discipline 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.

We have placed a huge emphasis on becoming a PBIS school. We have passionate leaders in charge of rewarding positive behaviors for both students and teachers.

We have an amazing Spider's Den open on Wednesday and Friday for students who have been rewarded from their teachers. We have a spider's store where student's collect spider dollars to buy items (we are currently upgrading to Hero k-12), We have daily positive shout-outs for students and teachers, as well as A-Team celebrations and other fun activities for our students.

Our Success team is actively working with students with indicators weekly to ensure their success this school year. We also will be utilizing SEL lessons in the classroom to help students gain social, emotional maturity.

We are changing the way we think about student behaviors and putting in to place a system that works.

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

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 and Junior Achievement Career Fair, Family Engagement dinner and Webb Parent University.

We also invite Community Members to be involved with our school. Many Community stakeholders (Brinks Foundation and Novopharm) volunteer their time and donate school supplies for our students. We work hard to be inclusive and to garner community support.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00