

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Webb Middle School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Webb Middle School

6035 HANLEY RD, Tampa, FL 33634

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Glenda Vinueza

Start Date for this Principal: 7/8/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Webb Middle School

6035 HANLEY RD, Tampa, FL 33634

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Everybody, Everyday, No Excuses!

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Students Can and Will Learn.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vinueza, Glenda	Principal	
Tumelty, Denise	Math Coach	
Lum, Alyssa	SAC Member	
Roberts, Anita	Assistant Principal	
Garcia, Heylen	School Counselor	
Beck, Meagan	School Counselor	
Barfield-Craig, Katherine	Attendance/Social Work	
Cool, Joseph	Instructional Coach	
Miranda, Jennifer	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Robitaille, Colette	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/8/2022, Glenda Vinueza

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

766

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

14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	260	220	286	0	0	0	0	766	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	69	98	0	0	0	0	230	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	54	96	0	0	0	0	158	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	64	108	0	0	0	0	252	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	57	91	0	0	0	0	237	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	26	46	0	0	0	0	74

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/22/2022

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	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		

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	50%	50%				50%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						58%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						54%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	43%	36%	36%				59%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%						68%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						57%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	52%	53%				44%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	58%	58%				69%	67%	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	2022					
	2019	47%	53%	-6%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	52%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2022					
	2019	47%	53%	-6%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	55%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
08	2022					
	2019	37%	31%	6%	46%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	48%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	62%	67%	-5%	71%	-9%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	63%	31%	61%	33%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	19	36	26	14	52	57	11	15			
ELL	31	46	37	36	59	66	31	69	81		
BLK	25	45	29	29	53	69	19	60			
HSP	42	51	39	43	58	65	46	68	75		
MUL	35	44		58	82						
WHT	46	45		45	60	62	53	70	50		
FRL	41	50	36	42	58	64	43	71	70		
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		

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
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										
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

In almost every area, we showed improvement and are back on the right track. Math- all areas, Civics, Science and ELA Proficiency and learning gains all improved.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component which needs the greatest improvement is learning gains-bottom quartile in ELA.

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. 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. Present and utilize various ESOL strategies (from Ellevation and our ESOL Specialist) to assist teachers in making instructional decisions. 3. Small group pull outs/push ins. 4. Creating a mindset that we are all ESOL teachers across content areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA and Math Achievement – improved compared to 2021
 ELA and Math Learning Gains, All – improved compared to 2021
 Math Learning Gains, Lowest 25% - greatest growth in last 4 testing years
 Science improved compared to 2021
 Civics improved 17% overall compared to 2021

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

The contributing factors to this improvement are due to consistent procedures and teacher practices in and out of the classroom as well as targeted instruction by coaches and resources to help student's specific needs. Coaches also presented small group instruction and engagement PD to faculty to support teacher's overall classroom practices. Many areas also held bootcamps for FSA earlier and more consistently than in the past to target specific students and their needs in the lead up to FSA. Our focus was to identify what students need and how do we help them learn the information.

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 other note taking and study skills throughout all content areas. Also, teachers while working collaboratively, 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: ESOL and ESE strategies, small group instruction and using data to create small groups, student engagement, 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 academic walk throughs to obtain data to drive professional development for our teachers. Our focus will be on student engagement, purposeful small group instruction, and using data to make instructional decisions. We will provide supports to teachers either in mini-PDs and/or with collaborative coaching and planning.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Increase student learning by providing high quality instruction through effective planning using explicit instruction, grouping structures, and opportunities for discussion.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The measurable outcome will be visible through best practices in the classroom based on standards, student needs, curriculum and engagement. This will also be a cornerstone of our PLCs and any faculty professional development to ensure teachers have the tools they need to be successful in the classroom.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

In PLCs, teachers will collaborate by grade level where they will use BEST standards, progress monitoring data, instructional frameworks, small group instruction techniques, and discussion techniques to increase the engagement and rigor of lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence-based strategy being used to implement this focus is the use of collaborative PLC protocols to ensure teachers are able to get the help they need with the new standards and curriculum to be able to implement in their classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teachers are learning new standards and curriculum. They need to be supported by using the instructional frameworks, small groups, data monitoring, discussion/academic talk, and assessments to make sure students are engaged, have the right amount of rigor for their learning, and are progressing through grade-level materials.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Through academic walkthroughs, admin and coaches will see evidence of student engagement through instructional choices.

Person Responsible

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

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

Person Responsible

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Provide purposeful, targeted small group instruction across content areas to improve literacy proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

The measurable outcome is evidence of literacy components in student writing and use of academic vocabulary during observations/walkthroughs.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Reading Resource 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 with purposeful small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Reading strategy school wide - Metacognitive Markers for text-marking as well as note taking and study skills - disseminated through ILT/PLC

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The Instructional Leadership Team will follow up on last year's school-wide strategy: metacognitive markers and will support and deepen teacher and student understanding of this literacy strategy. The ILT team will also discuss different note taking and study skills to add further layers to student understanding to complement literacy efforts by teachers in their classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Meet with ILT team to discuss metacognitive markers and other literacy strategies to use schoolwide and how to implement these strategies through PLCs.

Person Responsible

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Provide trainings in PLCs on the literacy strategies

Person Responsible

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Monitor the use of the strategies school wide in various content areas and provide supports to teachers as needed

Person Responsible

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 to students who have been rewarded from their teachers. We have a spider's store where student's collect spider dollars to buy items. 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 school culture and environment.

Parent involvement makes a huge difference in student learning. We will invite and involve parents in the School Advisory Council, Family and Parent Engagement 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, and other community outreach events like Hispanic Heritage Night and so on.

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.