

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Williams 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Williams Middle Magnet School

5020 N 47TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Dante Jones

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)	47%
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 (80%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (75%)
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	22

Williams Middle Magnet School

5020 N 47TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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	No	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

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.

We encourage students to aspire to engage in academic rigor as they pursue knowledge and skills to be lifelong learners. Students aspire to achieve balance between educational excellence and personal strengths and interests. The Williams community supports the development of responsible open-minded students who, as members of the global community, appreciate the diversity of the world in which they live.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Williams IB Middle Years Programme aims to provide a challenging international education that empowers students to become knowledgeable, caring and engaged global scholars who make positive contributions in the world around them

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
Blackwood-Green, Shellie	Principal	-Instructional Leader, hire and retain staff, develop budgets, evaluate staff and manage facilities for learning
Menendez, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Mathematics
Coulsey, Kalena	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Literacy
Dutzar, Monica	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Social Studies
Cotton, Claire	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Science
Puppa, Cory	Teacher, K-12	IB/Magnet Lead Teacher
Jankowski, Sarah	Instructional Media	Media Specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Dante Jones

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

838

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

11

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

8

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	308	277	244	0	0	0	0	829
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	36	43	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	6	0	0	0	0	36
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	14	25	7	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	4	0	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	16	19	0	0	0	0	66

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	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/11/2021

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	261	262	0	0	0	0	828
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	25	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
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	14	25	7	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	4	0	0	0	0	61

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	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	

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	261	262	0	0	0	0	828	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	25	0	0	0	0	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	
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	14	25	7	0	0	0	0	46	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	4	0	0	0	0	61	

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				83%	51%	54%	82%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	52%	54%	72%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	47%	47%	60%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				87%	55%	58%	87%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				75%	57%	57%	74%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70%	52%	51%	59%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				79%	47%	51%	77%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				94%	67%	72%	88%	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	88%	54%	34%	52%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
08	2021					
	2019	82%	53%	29%	56%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	83%	49%	34%	55%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	91%	62%	29%	54%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
08	2021					
	2019	44%	31%	13%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	80%	47%	33%	48%	32%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	67%	27%	71%	23%

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	95%	63%	32%	61%	34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	57%	41%	57%	41%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring assessments used for ELA in 2020-21 were Achieve 3000 for reading and district FSA-style assessments for writing.

Progress monitoring assessments for math in 2020-2021 were district common assessments.

All assessments were administered three times during the year - baseline, midyear, and end-of-year.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	127.8	84/34.3	279/20.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/17.8	13/20.3	21/11
	Students With Disabilities	3/13	4/20	0
	English Language Learners	8/24	11/63.7	9/32
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	205/18.5	189/64.7	279/22.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/17.9	52/51.5	39/14
	Students With Disabilities	2/9.5	16/62.6	0
	English Language Learners	4/15.4	3/36.25	6/2.2

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/15.4	47/19.4	259/17.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/11.8	10/10.4	27/10.4
	Students With Disabilities	0	1/4.8	0
	English Language Learners	3/10.7	7/17.5	6/2.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38/18.5	28/41.7	263/18.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/17.9	20/40.9	30/11.4
	Students With Disabilities	2/9.5	1/25.9	0
	English Language Learners	5/16	7/37.8	41.5
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40/17.9	220/59	230/12.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/20.5	82/53.6	22/10
	Students With Disabilities	7/31.8	24/46.8	0
	English Language Learners	8/19	3/48.9	2/8

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60/23.2	97/38	229/19.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/7.5	15/16.7	25/11
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.2	2/8.7	0
	English Language Learners	5/11.9	12/28.6	3/1.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41/16.5	26/43.4	193/26.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/18.8	44.1%	36/19
	Students With Disabilities	0	40.1%	0
	English Language Learners	0	43.1%	2/1
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	239/23.8	64/29.7	279/29
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/31.2	33/27.2	44/15.8
	Students With Disabilities	7/31.8	13/26.4	0
	English Language Learners	8/20.5	12/31.4	13/4.6

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	49	56	27	49	59	45		53			
ELL	78	81	74	67	60	50	60	74			
ASN	96	84	75	96	78	58	90	100	94		
BLK	59	55	37	52	47	49	50	79	52		
HSP	78	70	59	69	57	42	63	79	77		
MUL	79	72		76	59	40	81		82		
WHT	89	76	59	87	63	56	89	95	82		
FRL	67	63	46	57	48	44	59	79	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
SWD	68	74	67	55	64	72		91			
ELL	54	63	63	59	69	60		100			

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	93	72	65	98	83	78	90	97	99		
BLK	70	61	62	79	69	69	62	88	91		
HSP	81	66	60	82	74	68	72	96	95		
MUL	93	70	73	88	73	62	94	100	89		
WHT	92	77	86	93	79	84	91	98	96		
FRL	72	65	66	76	67	70	62	88	91		
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	47	59	39	53	53	33	25	25			
ELL	39	52	49	55	54	38	13	59			
ASN	97	86	90	100	86	75	99	96	100		
BLK	69	62	55	73	63	53	54	80	80		
HSP	73	62	53	82	71	65	56	83	93		
MUL	90	81		92	71		100	94	100		
WHT	89	72	71	95	77	75	90	92	95		
FRL	67	62	53	74	66	53	52	80	84		

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	69
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	619
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	68
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	86
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	53
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	66
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	70
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	77
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	58
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 most significant trend that emerged across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas was the two-fold negative effect of the majority of our students (2/3) participating in elearning in 2020, accompanied by a higher rate than normal of absenteeism. In addition, there was a great deal of mobility of some students between e- and face-to-face learning, which often meant a change in teachers; this too was disruptive to the learning process. In addition, due to unit losses, many teachers had to present material in a hybrid fashion, simultaneously teaching students online and face-to-face. This was definitely not the optimum learning model, but circumstances left us no choice.

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

The most significant need for improvement, in both English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics, is in the lowest 25% of our students (the bottom quartile academically). Students in this group in both subject areas experienced significant drops in learning gains, with a 17-point drop in ELA and a 22-point drop in 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?

Again, the most significant contributing factor to this need for improvement was the fact that the majority of these students, the most academically vulnerable in our school, participated in either elearning or simultaneous learning. Both of these models made it difficult for teachers to provide the additional support these students need and required students to be much more academically self-sufficient. Many students were easily distracted and disengaged at home, and teachers had no control over the learning environment.

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

Overall in ELA there was a three point learning gain from 2019 to 2021. In mathematics, 90% of the geometry students, 82% of the 7th grade algebra students, and 80% of the 6th grade Double Accelerated students made gains.

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

The major contributing factor to the improvement, particularly in mathematics, was the nature of the students themselves. Students in geometry, 7th grade algebra, and 6th grade Double Accelerated students are among the strongest academically in the school. The elearning/simultaneous teaching

methods had far fewer negative effects on them, as they are very academically resilient, motivated, and self-disciplined.

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

The major focus, now that we are back to a normal instructional delivery model, is to continually assess our students and provide support for those who fell behind last year - particularly those students in the bottom quartile. At the same time, we want to continue to challenge and push the rest of our students. This will require the use of common assessments within subject areas as well as time devoted in professional learning communities to data analysis and instructional planning. It will also require forming groups of students, both within and outside the classrooms, to provide targeted support and or acceleration.

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.

Our school is an IB school, so by its very nature it is designed to accelerate learning. Teachers and administrators are attending off-site as well as on-site IB professional development sessions to ensure we are meeting the standards set by IB. This year, our particular emphasis is on assessment, so the majority of our in-house professional development opportunities will have that focus and be followed up by data analysis and instructional planning in PLCs.

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

We had a number of changes in personnel last year, with several teachers leaving and new teachers joining our staff. We believe one of the most important things we can do as an IB instructional staff is provide consistency for our students across subject areas in the academic vocabulary we use. We have committed to ensuring the IB "Command Terms" are posted in our classrooms, taught to our students, and incorporated into the instructional fabric of our classrooms. This will provide a solid foundation upon which we can build after a year filled with upheaval due to COVID-19.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Assessment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Assessment was an area identified in the most recent report by IB evaluators after they completed a comprehensive review of instructional practices at our school. It is also a crucial area of focus to plan the best instruction for students in our bottom quartile, who experienced drops in learning gains last year.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the bottom quartile in ELA and mathematics will show an increase in learning gains of at least 10 points on the FSA ELA and Mathematics tests.
Monitoring:	We will use the new baseline assessments identified by the district, SpringBoard common assessments, and teacher-made common assessments to monitor the learning gains of students in the bottom quartile. These students will also use Brightfish reading software, which monitors their progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shellie Blackwood-Green (shellie.blackwood-green@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is the IB Middle Years Programme (MYP) assessment rubrics. MYP rubrics are generic and describe holistic judgments of each student's performance. Teachers use MYP rubrics to assess the prescribed subject-group objectives, but teachers must create task-specific clarifications that specify how the objective strand(s) will be assessed in the context of the summative task. Questions teachers must consider include:</p> <p>What will the student produce or demonstrate at each achievement level?</p> <p>What evidence will determine a student's achievement level?</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We selected this strategy because it supports quality instruction, student agency, and reflection upon learning. IB Resource Central provides materials, training, and support for the implementation of this strategy. These rubrics can be added to Canvas for ease of grading. We are fortunate to also have the assistance of our on-site IB Coordinator.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide staff development on the MYP assessment rubrics and identify staff members with experience clarifying the rubrics to meet the specific needs of different summative tasks.

Person Responsible Cory Puppa (cory.puppa@hcps.net)

Ensure subject area leaders work with teachers in PLCs to create summative tasks and their accompanying assessment rubrics for IB units.

Person Responsible Shellie Blackwood-Green (shellie.blackwood-green@hcps.net)

Ensure administrators and subject area leaders are visiting classrooms to look for evidence of the use of MYP assessment rubrics.

Person Responsible Shellie Blackwood-Green (shellie.blackwood-green@hcps.net)

Ensure progress monitoring occurs across the board, with a particular emphasis on the progress of students in the bottom quartile in ELA and mathematics.

Person Responsible Shellie Blackwood-Green (shellie.blackwood-green@hcps.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to Culturally Responsive Classrooms

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The student population of our school is extremely diverse, but this diversity is not reflected in our teachers, the majority of whom are white. This situation, together with social justice issues being raised in today's headlines, makes providing culturally responsive classrooms more critical now than ever before. This is even more important at an IB MYP school, where students are being prepared to think and act collaboratively and with a global perspective.</p> <p>When students feel accepted and valued at school, their academic achievement increases. This increase can be even more dramatic with students who are currently functioning academically in the bottom quartile of the student population.</p> <p>Finally, results from the most recent Student SEL Supports & Environment Survey showed only 38% of our students responded favorably to the question, "How well do people in your school understand you as a person?" and 32% responded favorably to "How connected do you feel to the adults at your school?" Only 39% of students responded favorably to "How much do you matter to others at this school?"</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>On the next Student SEL Supports & Environment Survey, 50% or more of students will respond favorably to these questions:</p> <p>"How well do people in your school understand you as a person?"</p> <p>"How connected do you feel to the adults at your school?"</p> <p>"How much do you matter to others at this school?"</p>
Monitoring:	<p>This Area of Focus will be monitored by measuring rates of attendance and discipline referrals, as well as the number of students seeking assistance from the Student Services Department for concerns related to classrooms/teachers.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Shellie Blackwood-Green (shellie.blackwood-green@hcps.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Morrison, Robinson and Rose (2008) synthesized the research on culturally relevant teaching and developed the following list of evidence-based strategies, all of which support this Area of Focus:</p> <p>Modeling, scaffolding, and clarification of challenging curriculum; using student strengths as starting points and building on their funds of knowledge; investing in and taking personal responsibility for students' success; creating and nurturing cooperative environments; having high behavioral expectations; reshaping the prescribed curriculum; encouraging relationships among schools and communities; promoting critical literacy; engaging students in social justice work; making explicit the power dynamics of mainstream society; sharing power in the classroom</p>
Rationale for	<p>Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. H., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research. <i>Equity & Excellence in Education</i>, 41(4), 433–452.</p> <p>These strategies were found in a resource produced by the United States Department of Education, a resource that includes work by researchers the faculty was introduced to at a</p>

Evidence-based Strategy: workshop on culturally responsive teaching held during pre-planning and delivered by district staff.

Action Steps to Implement

Arrange with district staff to provide follow-up/check-in workshops on culturally responsive teaching at the end of semester one to enable teachers to reflect upon what strategies they have been implementing and enable them to plan for semester two.

Person Responsible Shellie Blackwood-Green (shellie.blackwood-green@hcps.net)

Arrange for administrators, Student Services Staff, and subject area leaders to visit classrooms and look for evidence of the implementation of culturally responsive teaching strategies.

Person Responsible Shellie Blackwood-Green (shellie.blackwood-green@hcps.net)

Ensure subject area leaders have culturally responsive teaching strategies on the agenda of each PLC. What is working? Subject area leaders could potentially identify model classrooms.

Person Responsible Shellie Blackwood-Green (shellie.blackwood-green@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.

According to the discipline data provided, the area of greatest concern was vandalism. Vandalism can be interpreted as disconnection or disengagement with the school. Therefore, our Area of Focus on culturally responsive classrooms, which is designed to increase students' engagement with and affection for the school (and its property) should make a difference. We will monitor this through the examination of discipline data, with an emphasis on the number of incidents of vandalism.

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.

Williams Middle Magnet School is proud to be an International Baccalaureate (IB) Middle Years Programme site. As such, 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 school's 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, open-minded, 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.

We continue to experience challenges in hosting face-to-face interactions with internal and external stakeholders, due to precautions related to COVID-19 and its variants. Despite these challenges, Williams Middle Magnet School prides itself on its family atmosphere, both within our school family of students and school staff, as well as by extension to the families of our students. This year we have brought back our monthly club days on the last Monday of each month, where students are able to enjoy interacting with their friends doing activities, crafts, sports, etc. they choose. Each club is sponsored by one or more teacher, so students and teachers have the opportunity to interact at school but in a non-academic setting. Whenever possible we host opportunities for families to visit our school, both virtually and in-person for IB Open Houses and "Family Fun Nights." We also encourage them to get involved in events in the larger community, such as the Temple Terrace Public Library's annual book drive. Service is an integral part of the IB program, and students have the opportunity, beginning in sixth grade, to take part in community service events like the "Coastal Cleanup."

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Assessment	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Culturally Responsive Classrooms	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00