Williams Middle Magnet School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Williams Middle Magnet School

5020 N 47TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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.

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 to the world around them

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
Jones, Dante	Principal	The Principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative,and counseling activities of a middle or a career center public school site. The Principal demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Dunn, Peyton	Teacher, K-12	The Department Head-Sr./Subject Area Leader is responsible for content area leadership in collaboration with site-based administrators and content supervisors.
Cotton, Claire	Teacher, K-12	The Department Head-Sr./Subject Area Leader is responsible for content area leadership in collaboration with site-based administrators and content supervisors.
Menendez, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	The Department Head-Sr./Subject Area Leader is responsible for content area leadership in collaboration with site-based administrators and content supervisors.
Dutzar, Monica	Teacher, K-12	The Department Head-Sr./Subject Area Leader is responsible for content area leadership in collaboration with site-based administrators and content supervisors.
Weedon-Zimmerman, Michelle	Magnet Coordinator	The Teacher, Magnet Lead, will coordinate site-based magnet program activities,integrate each magnet program's theme into curricula, explore partnerships to enhance each magnet program's educational offerings, and market the magnet program to potential families and the community
Hogsett, Tracey	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist will Provide Literacy support schoolwide, instruction classes for content areas based on Literacy components.
Callaway, Brooklyn	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal 1, Middle, will assist with the instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of a middle school.

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 following members were elected and/or appointed as members of the School Advisory Council:
Tracey Hogsett - SAC Chair

Waterman - CTA Representative
Kiara Jackosn - Parent
Anayda Perez - Parent
Catrice Reese - Parent
Nataleigh Sanchez - Parent
Omar Alem - Parent
Nick Strippoli - Parent

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 School Improvement Plan will be monitored by regular meeting, 8 or more, of the School Advisory Committee. Adjustments and modifications will be made as necessary to meet the needs of the students and to close any achievement gaps.

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	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
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	34	23	28	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	37	20	67
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	16	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	10	0	30
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	11	16	13	40

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	31	29	27	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	31	62
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	11	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	44	6	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	17	57
	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	4	3	6	13

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	31	29	27	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	31	62
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	11	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	44	6	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	17	57
	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	4	3	6	13

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*	77	49	49	80	50	50	79		
ELA Learning Gains				66			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			49		
Math Achievement*	82	57	56	80	36	36	75		
Math Learning Gains				76			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			48		
Science Achievement*	72	44	49	70	52	53	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	91	66	68	95	58	58	87		
Middle School Acceleration	92	84	73	97	51	49	77		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress		39	40		86	76			

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	83
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	682
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	66			
HSP	79			
MUL	82			
PAC				

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%
WHT	90			
FRL	67			

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	42			
ELL	72			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	63			
HSP	71			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	66			

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	77			82			72	91	92			
SWD	31			39			23	44			4	
ELL	56			63				67			3	
AMI												
ASN	94			97			94	100	97		5	
BLK	59			67			44	79	80		5	
HSP	74			80			68	89	84		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
MUL	72			72			85	88	92		5	
PAC												
WHT	88			90			81	98	94		5	
FRL	61			66			50	82	74		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	80	66	53	80	76	65	70	95	97			
SWD	51	53	23	42	40	35	35	60				
ELL	79	66	57	76	78	59	42	97	96			
AMI												
ASN	97	76	94	97	91	83	96	100	100			
BLK	61	57	50	57	60	58	48	89	89			
HSP	73	58	42	76	74	64	69	90	95			
MUL	77	54	46	79	74	62	70	92	100			
PAC												
WHT	91	76	61	94	80	86	76	100	98			
FRL	64	58	50	62	64	61	55	87	90			

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	79	71	49	75	61	48	72	87	77			
SWD	49	56	27	49	59	45		53				
ELL	78	81	74	67	60	50	60	74				
AMI												
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			
PAC												
WHT	89	76	59	87	63	56	89	95	82			

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
FRL	67	63	46	57	48	44	59	79	61			

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	77%	47%	30%	47%	30%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	44%	36%	47%	33%
06	2023 - Spring	75%	47%	28%	47%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	81%	53%	28%	54%	27%
07	2023 - Spring	45%	36%	9%	48%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	90%	57%	33%	55%	35%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	74%	41%	33%	44%	30%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	55%	37%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	49%	50%	48%	51%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	64%	27%	66%	25%

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.

Williams scored above the district and the state in every subject area and grade level measured, which is typical of our school. Comparing scores from this year to last year, there is a generally positive trend of increased achievement in all areas.

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

With there being a baseline this year to compare data, Williams will be able to more accurately assess the gains students make at all levels/content areas.

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.

Williams is above the state average in all areas.

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

There was improvement in proficiency in all students.
The school went to an 8 period day which allowed for Tutoring during the extended lunch period.
This provides an opportunity for all grade levels to get assistance as needed in any subject area.

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

There has been an increase in the amount of directly certified for Free/reduced lunch, which will increase the need for added resources to meet their needs.

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

Differentiation
Engagement
Standards Aligned Instruction
Assessment

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 Differentiation

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.

As in other IB programmes, students in the MYP are expected to develop approaches to learning skills and the attributes of the IB learner profile. The IB learner is positively challenged to think critically and to learn in a flexible environment crossing disciplinary, cultural and national boundaries. In order to facilitate this flexible learning environment, instruction must be flexible and include opportunities for differentiated instruction. This is particularly important in subject areas where heterogeneous grouping is the norm, and students with a wide variety of achievement levels, particularly in reading, are in the same classes. Our school is already extremely diverse in culture, and this diversity extends, as it does in most middle schools, to diversity in academic achievement success. Therefore, we have determined that teacher-led small groups will be one of the best instructional practices to implement to meet the movement needs of our active middle school adolescents and ensure they are all getting what they need instructionally in each class, whether that is enrichment or remediation.

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

We will see 25% greater improvement in achievement from the beginning of the year assessments to the mid-year assessments in all subject areas for students whose teachers are implementing teacher-led small groups with fidelity at least three times a week.

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

Under the leadership of our assistant principal for curriculum, our subject area leaders will encourage teachers at professional learning community meetings to implement teacher-led small groups. These will also be implemented during our extended lunch periods for students who may require additional remediation or enrichment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Brooklyn Callaway (brooklyn.callaway@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.)

Collaboration
Learning Styles
Purposeful Grouping
Student Questions
Providing instruction to small groups of students is a tried-and-true way to differentiate and support students. In order to plan the groups effectively, data are used—whether from observations or a quiz or other formative assessment—to inform these groupings. These groupings are dynamic and should change based on timely data and feedback we gather.
We need to ensure that we provide small group instruction that leverages students' funds of knowledge rather than using a deficit approach. We should also guide students to look to each other for help rather than relying on the teacher as the sole source of learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Variety of instructional strategies Working in small groups/partners Students sharing ideas Students helping each other learn Strategic questioning Scaffolding of lesson to meet diverse student needs.

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.

Provide staff development throughout the school year on teacher-led small group instruction

Person Responsible: Brooklyn Callaway (brooklyn.callaway@hcps.net)

By When: Continually throughout the 2023-2024 school year,

#2. Positive Culture and Environment 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.

another area of improvement that was noted in our most recent IB programmatic review was the implementation of the IB Community Service Project. This project, designed for students in their third and final year of the programme (grade 8) is defined in this way by the International Baccalaureate MYP staff: "MYP students in their final year explore an area of personal interest [community service] over an extended period. It provides them the opportunity to consolidate their learning and develop important skills they'll need in
both further education and life beyond the classroom. It also helps them develop confidence to become principled, lifelong learners."

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

By the time of the next IB MYP programmatic review, this area will be implemented with such a significant improvement in fidelity that it will no longer be an area in need of improvement but will be considered either satisfactory of above satisfactory.

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

Under the guidance of our IB Lead Teacher, working closely with the AVID and technology teachers as well as the eighth grade team leaders, supervising teachers chosen by students will monitor each eighth grader's implementation of the IB Community Service Project. A timeline with specific dates for check-ins will be distributed to ensure students are working at a good pace, making progress, and not procrastinating.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Weedon-Zimmerman (michelle.weedon-zimmerman@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.)

Students complete three elements:
1 Product or outcome—evidence of tangible or intangible results: what the student was aiming to achieve or create
2. Process journal—ideas, criteria, developments, challenges, plans, research, possible solutions and progress reports
3. Report—an account of the project and its impact, to a structure that follows the assessment criteria. The report includes a bibliography and evidence from the process journal that documents students' development and achievements.
The report is assessed by the supervisor and externally moderated by the IB to ensure a globally consistent standard of excellence. Each project is awarded a final achievement grade.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The IB Personal/Community Service Project is an important and required component of the IB MYP. Not only is our school required to implement this with fidelity to remain an IB

MYP school, engaging students in community service is an integral part of preparing them to be productive members of the global community.

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.

Create an IB Community Project committee to ensure a consistent message is delivered to 8th graders, 8th grade teachers, parents, and guardians.

Person Responsible: Michelle Weedon-Zimmerman (michelle.weedon-zimmerman@hcps.net)

By When: Beginning of 2023-2024 School Year

Work with District and community personnel to provide students with community service students with community service project, to be implemented in the 2023-2024 school year, that involves all three grade levels at our school.

Person Responsible: Michelle Weedon-Zimmerman (michelle.weedon-zimmerman@hcps.net)

By When: Continually throughout the 2023-2024 School Year,