

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Walker Middle Magnet School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Walker Middle Magnet School

8282 N MOBLEY RD, Odessa, FL 33556

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Equipping globally minded students to think, collaborate, and act with care.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to take what they have learned and use it to make the world a better place.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Holloway, Heather	Principal	The principal serves as instructional leader of the school, engages stakeholders in monitoring data, reviewing the SIP goals and creates a collaborative culture where all participate in the decision-making process. The principal ensures SAC is comprised of properly elected representatives, provides leadership in the development, revision, and implementation of the schoolwide improvement plan, submits the SAC-approved SIP to the district for school board approval, and keeps members informed of relevant policies and activities of the school, district, and state.
Corder, Josephine	Magnet Coordinator	Walker's IB Magnet Coordinator serves as an instructional leader and SAC Chair, engages stakeholders and collaborates to ensure the SIP is created using the shared ideas of all stakeholders on campus. She serves the teachers in support of carrying out the SIP goals, action steps and ensures that the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme is implemented in all classes through unit planning, classroom instruction, and school wide programming, and differentiated professional development. The Chair is responsible for notifying members of upcoming meeting and votes. The chair will facilitate the SAC meetings and inform the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities. The Chair ensures that a quorum is present before an action item on the agenda comes to a vote and works in collaboration with the SSAC secretary to ensure minutes are recorded and filed properly.
Franks, Andria	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves as instructional leader of the school, engages stakeholders in monitoring data, reviewing the SIP goals and creates a collaborative culture where all participate in the decision-making process. The assistant principal works with the SAC chair to ensure SAC is comprised of properly elected representatives, provides leadership in the development, revision, and implementation of the Schoolwide improvement plan, submits the SAC approved SIP to the district for school board approval, and keeps members informed of relevant policies and activities of the school, district, and state.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Instructional Leadership Team which includes the Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Magnet Coordinator, Subject Area Leaders for Math, Science, Social Studies, and ELA, Elective Team Leader and School Counselor review all of the FAST and B.E.S.T. EOC from 2022-2023 data. The Instructional Priorities from the previous year are reviewed and recommendations were made for the 2023-2024 school year. The FAST and B.E.S.T. EOC data and recommendations from the Instructional Leadership Team were presented to the faculty during pre-planning. The data and proposed instructional priorities, areas of progress and opportunities for growth were discussed in each subject area PLC. The

Subject Area Leaders and Elective Leader brought the recommendations from their departments back to the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT). The instructional priorities were set at the ILT meeting and the proposed Instructional priorities were share with all faculty members for a review and vote. The faculty approved Instructional Priorities were then sent to the 2023-24 SAC members for review. At the August SAC meeting, following discussion, the SAC members voted to approve the Instructional Priorities for the 2023-2024 school year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The Subject Area Leaders and their department members, after analyzing the trend data for in their subject, developed the Areas of Focus, Action Steps, and Timeline for Progress Monitoring. The Subject Area Leaders brought their Subject Plan to the Instructional Leadership Team for review and revisions as needed.

The progress monitoring data is reviewed at Subject Area PLCs, which includes the subject area leader and all of the same subject classroom teachers every other Tuesday throughout the school year. The members of the Instructional Leadership Team are updated by the subject area leader, every other Friday throughout the school year. The instructional priorities are listed on every meeting agenda and connections are made to ensure the instructional priorities are being met throughout the school.

When needed, a revision to the priorities will be recommended, discussed with all stakeholders and then updated within the CIMS.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	32%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	17	31	84	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	28	43	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	0	42	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	0	21	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	7	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	7	25	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	16	49	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	19	22	52	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	7	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	7	25	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	16	49	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	19	22	52	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	83	49	49	83	50	50	82		
ELA Learning Gains				69			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61			58		
Math Achievement*	90	57	56	85	36	36	78		
Math Learning Gains				76			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			45		
Science Achievement*	80	44	49	81	52	53	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	92	66	68	93	58	58	89		
Middle School Acceleration	94	84	73	97	51	49	88		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress		39	40	36	86	76	92		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	88
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	749
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	64			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	82			
HSP	84			
MUL	89			
PAC				
WHT	87			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	81			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	62			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	81			
HSP	73			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	73			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	83			90			80	92	94			
SWD	56			64			61	69	69		5	
ELL	70			83			50	62			4	
AMI												
ASN	93			99			94	96	99		5	
BLK	82			80			76	84	89		5	
HSP	76			84			73	90	96		5	
MUL	87			87			85	94	94		5	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	83			92			78	92	91		5	
FRL	76			83			75	82	91		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	83	69	61	85	76	68	81	93	97			36
SWD	54	60	48	63	73	64	50	80				
ELL	65	67	53	77	68	52	56	88	100			36
AMI												
ASN	92	76	58	97	89	80	90	100	100			
BLK	81	74	71	79	79	74	80	100	94			
HSP	76	65	56	78	71	64	72	84	92			
MUL	81	69	57	83	72	70	88	93	94			
PAC												
WHT	84	67	65	86	74	67	82	94	98			
FRL	73	62	56	78	72	68	66	90	92			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	82	71	58	78	58	45	69	89	88			92
SWD	45	53	46	44	46	29	41	54				
ELL	69	71	66	68	61	41	29	83				92
AMI												
ASN	94	82	82	94	73	58	84	93	98			
BLK	72	62	54	72	52	48	37	95	73			
HSP	75	65	52	67	50	41	60	86	77			
MUL	90	75	82	84	54	80	81	88	88			
PAC												
WHT	82	73	56	80	59	43	75	88	93			
FRL	72	64	53	66	49	40	63	83	81			91

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	85%	47%	38%	47%	38%
08	2023 - Spring	79%	44%	35%	47%	32%
06	2023 - Spring	82%	47%	35%	47%	35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	89%	53%	36%	54%	35%
07	2023 - Spring	56%	36%	20%	48%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	95%	57%	38%	55%	40%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	80%	41%	39%	44%	36%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	55%	39%	50%	44%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	64%	28%	66%	26%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

- 7th grade math (7R) students ranked #1 in district

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

-6th grade ELA (-4) ranked #1 in district

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

- Although above the state in all areas, 7th grade math (56%) was the closest to state average (48%)

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

- 7th grade math +36 points

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

- Attendance added to MTSS for regular monitoring at the grade level and Honor team

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

- Positive school culture (PBIS) as it relates to discipline procedures in place for warning and revocation, tracked in Teams

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Literacy and AVID strategies, as well as IB philosophies, will be embedded into all content area instruction to increase proficiency in all subgroups.

In order to increase reading skills, all teachers must implement similar reading strategies into all subject area curriculums.

AVID strategies promote rigor through WICOR: Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization and Reading. These methods increase engagement through student ownership, accountability, and critical thinking.

All subject area courses will develop unit plans for all IB MYP teaching. Teachers of the same course must collaborate in the design and reflection of each unit ensuring that all lessons are reflective of the IB MYP philosophies and curriculum framework.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the percent of students who are proficient in reading in each grade level by implementing common reading strategies across all curriculums. Increase engagement through student ownership, accountability, and critical thinking by using AVID strategies.

All subject area courses will develop unit plans for all IB MYP teaching. Teachers of the same course must collaborate in the design and reflection of each unit ensuring that all lessons are reflective of the IB MYP curriculum framework and philosophies.

ELA Subject Area Leader will lead their department RtI PLC in reviewing the results of the progress monitoring assessments and the discussion of specific interventions and teaching strategies. All Subject Area Leaders will monitor the inclusion of reading and AVID strategies in all unit plans and lead the PLC discussions in their specific content area.

Teachers will meet as a same course PLC to develop unit plans in Toddle. Teachers will meet in PLC and or individually as needed with the IB Coordinator.

Monitoring:

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

Evaluative observations by administration as well as non-evaluative IB and Instructional classroom walk-throughs using the "look fors" developed by each academic department and the IB Classroom "look fors" developed by the IB Pedagogical Leadership Team. The walk-throughs will be conducted by Subject Area Leaders, Elective Leader, Principal, Assistant Principals, and Magnet Coordinator.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers participate in monthly PLC meetings as a subject area department and as a same course PLC to collaboratively develop and reflect on unit plans using best practices and embedding the defining

features of the IB MYP. The Middle Years Programme Curriculum's defining features include conceptual understanding, global contexts, approaches to learning, service as action, inclusion and learning diversity, and STEM education.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

EET data. Feedback from IBO Evaluation visit. Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

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

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

By When: End of the school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

All stakeholders will experience a positive, supportive school culture and environment.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the percent of students who...

PBIS - Walker Culture of Honor

Monitoring:

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

Our school culture and environment will be monitored through our Positive Behavioral Interventions Support (PBIS) team and plan, Panorama SEL survey for students data analysis, as well as regular review of our disciplinary data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Administrators and School Counselors meet with our students each semester through grade level assemblies to reinforce the PBIS plan and schoolwide expectations. Quarterly, teachers recognize outstanding students that are not only high academic achievers, but those that also exemplify the IB Learner Profile traits and uphold the IB Mission "to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect".

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Differentiation based on Knowledge of Students: Creative practices, teacher-led small group structures & knowledge of students will serve as a catalyst for providing an equitable learning environment and individualizing teaching and learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the percent of students who are proficient in each subject area, in each grade level, by implementing strategically developed small group, teacher led instruction strategies across all curriculums.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring assessments will be analyzed during monthly subject area, same course and grade level PLCs by all teachers. Subject Area Leaders meet monthly at the Instructional Leadership Team to share the results of the progress monitoring assessments and to share successful strategies used in their department.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Holloway (heather.holloway@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Small group, teacher led instruction in all subject areas. Student owned data collection and analysis for goal setting and progress toward standard mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

EET data. Feedback from IBO evaluation visit. Student achievement data trends across grade levels and subject areas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

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

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

By When: End of school year.

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus