

Orange County Public Schools

Judson B Walker Middle



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Judson B Walker Middle

150 AMIDON LN, Orlando, FL 32809

<https://walkerms.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Watson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Watson, Rebecca	Principal	<p>Principal: The Principal provides a common vision and direction for Walker Middle School, placing student success at the forefront. Teacher evaluations and progress monitoring are used to inform the decision-making process. Data-based decision-making is important as the principal oversees curriculum and instruction and ensures the School Improvement Plan is implemented throughout the school year. Communication flow and decision-making occurs through a system of distributed leadership including: [Admin Team: Principal and Assistant Principals]; [Core Leadership Team: Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Coaches, ELL Compliance Specialist, Staffing Specialist and Guidance Counselors]; [MTSS: Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Coaches, Guidance Counselors, Intervention specialists]; [Data Meetings: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, and content area teachers]. Decisions are discussed and evaluated by these individuals as members of the school-based leadership team and communicated to the stakeholders.</p> <p>Assistant Principals: The Assistant Principals work to support the vision and mission of Walker Middle School. They analyze behavioral and academic data to determine areas of focus. They support faculty development, curriculum, and instruction, provide teacher and staff support, and monitor planning and delivery of standards-based instruction. In addition, these individuals monitor the safety and security of the school environment for students, staff, and the community.</p> <p>Instructional Coaches (literacy/math/science/CRT), Intervention specialists: The instructional coaches provide content area support across grade levels. They work with the department members as they plan and deliver standards-based instruction focusing on the cognitive demands of the standards. The coaches model lessons, plan with teams, analyze student achievement data, and support teachers with aligned instructional strategies. The coaches are members of the MTSS team and participate in the process as they assist teachers and the team to develop appropriate intervention plans based on available data. They also assist in ensuring that progress monitoring is conducted on a regular basis in all content areas. These staff members may provide academic support directly to students in the form of intervention and remediation with the intention of increasing student academic success. Intervention specialists regularly pull small groups of students or push in classrooms to teach small groups for remediation of gap skills and reteach of grade level standards.</p> <p>Guidance Counselors: At Walker Middle School, the guidance counselors collaborate on school-wide initiatives to increase student achievement and provide behavioral support. They work closely with the teachers through MTSS. The instructional</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>coaches, guidance counselors, and classroom teachers work together to determine appropriate interventions for students. Their involvement with the MTSS Team includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previewing and gathering data necessary to prepare for a School Support Team (SST) meeting • Participating in the SST/Problem Solving Team’s review and evaluation of student data • Utilizing problem-solving skills to help identify and assess the learning, development, adjustment characteristics and needs of students as well as the environmental factors affecting learning • Scheduling and facilitating meetings initiated/triggered by student academic referrals <p>School Social Worker: Our Social Worker is a resource to the leadership team, students, and families. The School Social Worker will observe and meet with family members in order to assist them in accessing available resources in the community. The School Social Worker will also suggest interventions and provide guidance to the team in the problem-solving process.</p> <p>CCT: This position goes beyond compliance and paperwork to take an active role in the decision making process on the leadership team. As the facilitator of the ELL PLC, the CCT works with teachers to build their capacity with ELL strategies during classroom instruction. The CCT also ensures that ELL testing is completed with fidelity. This position is also responsible for parent communication and building relationships with the surrounding community.</p> <p>ESE teacher/compliance specialist: This individual works to make sure all ESE students receive the services they are entitled to based on their IEP. The ESE compliance specialist also meets with teachers and family members to ensure the needs of every child are aligned with the services they receive and communicates this information to all concerned parties. This individual also works with teachers in the classroom to provide instruction to students.</p>
Corlew, Joshua	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principals: The Assistant Principals work to support the vision and mission of Walker Middle School. They analyze behavioral and academic data to determine areas of focus. They support faculty development, curriculum, and instruction, provide teacher and staff support, and monitor planning and delivery of standards-based instruction. In addition, these individuals monitor the safety and security of the school environment for students, staff, and the community.</p>
Berriz, Sara	Instructional Coach	<p>Instructional Coaches (literacy/math/science/CRT), Intervention specialists: The instructional coaches provide content area</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>support across grade levels. They work with the department members as they plan and deliver standards-based instruction focusing on the cognitive demands of the standards. The coaches model lessons, plan with teams, analyze student achievement data, and support teachers with aligned instructional strategies. The coaches are members of the MTSS team and participate in the process as they assist teachers and the team to develop appropriate intervention plans based on available data. They also assist in ensuring that progress monitoring is conducted on a regular basis in all content areas. These staff members may provide academic support directly to students in the form of intervention and remediation with the intention of increasing student academic success. Intervention specialists regularly pull small groups of students or push in classrooms to teach small groups for remediation of gap skills and reteach of grade level standards.</p>
Hayward, Jacquelyn	Dean	
Garroni, Natalia	Instructional Coach	<p>Instructional Coaches (literacy/math/science/CRT), Intervention specialists: The instructional coaches provide content area support across grade levels. They work with the department members as they plan and deliver standards-based instruction focusing on the cognitive demands of the standards. The coaches model lessons, plan with teams, analyze student achievement data, and support teachers with aligned instructional strategies. The coaches are members of the MTSS team and participate in the process as they assist teachers and the team to develop appropriate intervention plans based on available data. They also assist in ensuring that progress monitoring is conducted on a regular basis in all content areas. These staff members may provide academic support directly to students in the form of intervention and remediation with the intention of increasing student academic success. Intervention specialists regularly pull small groups of students or push in classrooms to teach small groups for remediation of gap skills and reteach of grade level standards.</p>
King, Teresa	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principals: The Assistant Principals work to support the vision and mission of Walker Middle School. They analyze behavioral and academic data to determine areas of focus. They support faculty development, curriculum, and instruction, provide teacher and staff support, and monitor planning and delivery of standards-based instruction. In addition, these individuals monitor the safety and security of the school environment for students, staff, and the community.</p>
Grady, Corrine	Instructional Media	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rivers, Monique	Guidance Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/1/2017, Rebecca Watson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (51%)

	2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	81	51	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	42	58	0	0	0	0	105
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	60	49	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	62	106	0	0	0	0	235
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	85	83	0	0	0	0	251
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	88	92	0	0	0	0	250

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	99	120	121	0	0	0	0	340

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/27/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	310	356	333	0	0	0	0	999
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	81	69	0	0	0	0	196
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	80	55	0	0	0	0	200
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	150	72	0	0	0	0	302
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	191	183	0	0	0	0	469

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	55	80	84	0	0	0	0	219

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	310	356	333	0	0	0	0	999
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	81	69	0	0	0	0	196
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	80	55	0	0	0	0	200
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	150	72	0	0	0	0	302
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	191	183	0	0	0	0	469

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	55	80	84	0	0	0	0	219

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	35%	52%	54%	31%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	52%	54%	36%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	45%	47%	33%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	40%	55%	58%	29%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	57%	31%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	50%	51%	29%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	51%	51%	35%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	67%	72%	48%	68%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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	2019	37%	52%	-15%	54%	-17%
	2018	26%	48%	-22%	52%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	28%	48%	-20%	52%	-24%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	28%	48%	-20%	51%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
	2018	34%	55%	-21%	58%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	34%	43%	-9%	55%	-21%
	2018	24%	35%	-11%	52%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	32%	49%	-17%	54%	-22%
	2018	12%	51%	-39%	54%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	28%	36%	-8%	46%	-18%
	2018	16%	32%	-16%	45%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	34%	49%	-15%	48%	-14%
	2018	31%	49%	-18%	50%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	66%	-12%	71%	-17%
2018	41%	66%	-25%	71%	-30%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		13%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	63%	21%	61%	23%
2018	72%	61%	11%	62%	10%
Compare		12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	53%	16%	57%	12%
2018	85%	65%	20%	56%	29%
Compare		-16%			

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	43	45	19	42	41	9	21			
ELL	21	44	52	30	44	43	21	50	61		
ASN	85	85		67	48		93		73		
BLK	32	46	49	33	45	52	34	58	80		
HSP	32	47	54	38	52	47	32	56	77		
WHT	49	45	47	60	57	20	48	74	100		
FRL	32	46	53	38	48	49	34	58	73		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	8	23	22	11	28	27	4	18			
ELL	14	30	31	16	29	30	16	35	74		
ASN	63	60		68	57		50	92	83		
BLK	29	34	26	27	28	31	38	48	77		
HSP	29	34	36	28	31	27	33	45	68		
MUL	46	54		31	46						
WHT	37	41	38	29	28	36	26	54	90		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
FRL	32	37	34	29	30	29	32	47	75		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	49
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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
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%	2

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
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	48
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	56
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

All areas showed increase in performance from 17-18 to 18-19. Formative data from 19-20 shows increases and no significant drops in achievement.

ELA achievement showed greatest gains followed by Science and then Math achievement.

SWD subgroup is below the federal index of 41% with 29% .

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

All areas showed improvement in 18-19. ELA achievement had the lowest overall score and only an increase of four percentage points from previous year. Formative data showed this trend to remain the same with an increase projected of between 2-4%.

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

ELA achievement

Walker- 35% State average- 54%

Gap-19%: This is a trend especially in SWD.

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

Math learning gains showed an increase of 20 percentage points. A focus on high and low frequency pull-outs for Tier II and Tier III students contributed to the increase, as well as a focus on small group instruction in the core classrooms.

Civics achievement increased 16%: We added common formative assessment with small group intervention pull-outs.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Course failure- need to reduce in all areas

Attendance- will focus on a group of 7th graders who began a cohort in 6th.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Science proficiency
3. Math proficiency
4. SWD in both ELA and Math achievement
5. Acceleration

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: All teachers and academic areas will be responsible for delivering on grade level rigorous standards-based instruction. Academic achievement and proficiency will increase in all areas as a result of rigorous, standards-based instruction, use of high effect instructional strategies, and targeted intervention and enrichment for students. Overall ELA proficiency will increase five percentage points from 35% to 40% and math proficiency will increase from 40% to 45%.

Measureable Outcome: Overall ELA proficiency will increase five percentage points from 35% to 40% and math proficiency will increase from 40% to 45%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Watson (rebecca.watson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Feedback and support from academic coaches and intervention specialists- weekly Feedback through iObservation. Teachers will meet twice per week for lesson planning, analyzing data, increasing teacher content knowledge, and common assessment writing. District and Corrective programs personnel to assist and guide implementation and provide feedback. Specific feedback on lesson plans. Lesson plans will be uploaded to a common location and monitored by admin- weekly Intervention specialists will push in for Tier1 instruction and pull out for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention on gap skills and grade level reteach. Data analysis and MTSS processes to target students for intervention and enrichment. Establishment of morning tutoring and continuation of after school and Saturday tutoring. Specific attention to all levels for learning gains will be paramount in PLC conversations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Principal, admin, and coaches will conduct bi-weekly instructional reviews to monitor implementation. Data chats will occur on four levels: Principal to admin, Admin to coaches, Admin/coaches to teacher, teacher to student. iReady reports, PMA reports, and common assessment data utilizing SHED data system to analyze. MTSS study meetings. Specific monitoring of lesson plans. Reflection on coaching tasks and effectiveness with all academic coaches and intervention specialists.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Intervention/enrichment pull-outs- Tutors, Interventionists, Academic Coaches: weekly, 2x per week
2. Common formative assessment- small group instruction- All core content area teachers: weekly
3. High frequency small groups- tier 3- tutors, interventionists: 2-3 times per week
4. Internal instructional review- Leadership team- bi-weekly
5. Lesson plan monitoring and feedback- Admin- weekly

Person Responsible Rebecca Watson (rebecca.watson@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: One area of ESSA that remains below 41%. SWD achievement levels and learning gains will exceed 41%.

Measureable Outcome: SWD achievement levels and learning gains will exceed 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joshua Corlew (joshua.corlew@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Job-embedded professional development, including a focus on increasing teacher content knowledge will be planned and implemented. Coaching cycle and support will be established for teacher implementation and feedback will be given using iObservation. Lesson plans will be uploaded to a common site and feedback will be given. Collaborative sessions (PLCs) like that of teacher planning with a focus on data analysis, learning, and writing of assessments will happen twice per week. The two Intervention Specialists will push in during Tier 1 instruction and pull out during Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction. District and Corrective Programs assistance will be provided and teachers will follow FCIM process for problem solving as well as for planning intervention and enrichment. Establishment of morning tutoring and continuation of after school and Saturday tutoring is in the works as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Principal, admin, and coaches will conduct bi-weekly instructional reviews to monitor implementation. Data chats will occur on four levels: Principal to admin, Admin to coaches, Admin/ coaches to teacher, teacher to student. The SHED data system will be used to analyze common assessment information. The SHED data information along with iReady and PMA reports will be used to support MTSS study meetings. Monitoring of lesson plans inclusive of the reflection process and coaching to increase effectiveness will occur with with staffing specialists, ESE teachers, and support facilitators

Action Steps to Implement

1. High frequency pull-out- tutors, interventionists: 2-3 times per week
2. Small group instruction through support facilitation- ESE teachers: 3-4 times per week
3. Common formative assessment for frequent monitoring- All core content teachers: weekly
4. BPIE- identify professional development areas needed- Staffing specialist: monthly

Person Responsible Joshua Corlew (joshua.corlew@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students have limited literacy strategies in the areas of academic and content area vocabulary. Thirty-four percent of students speak a first language other than English. This limitation in literacy is evidenced by low scores in comprehension for ELA and also by other state assessments that have a large reading component. This area of focus also aligns with the DPLC's previous year's goals which is inclusive of close reading and student discourse.

Measureable Outcome: As a result of focused literacy strategies in all content areas, a common literacy system will be developed and fully implemented. Student proficiency in all academic areas will increase due to the use of literacy strategies and vocabulary instruction.
 ELA proficiency will increase five percentage points from 35% to 40%
 SWD achievement levels and learning gains will exceed 41%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Watson (rebecca.watson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Focused vocabulary instruction using the Marzano 6-step method. Targeted vocabulary instruction in DLA/DLAR class. MTSS support through MTSS team. Instructional coaching support for teacher effectiveness in implementation of strategies. ELL/ESE strategies implemented in lessons. ELL/ESE specific PLC sessions for targeted teacher support. Use culturally relevant text and multimedia in lessons. Content Area Literacy team to develop school-wide plan for implementation of two non-negotiable literacy strategies to occur in all classrooms. Creation of a school-wide intervention period for targeted practice will occur along with the formation of an interdisciplinary team to foster disciplinary-area literacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Monthly walkthroughs will be used to monitor specifically the implementation of the literacy system strategies. Lesson plans as well as the planning process will be monitored to give feedback about the delivery of instruction. Coaching support and feedback will be given to scaffold the teaching and learning processes. iObservation feedback will be provided by administrators and data analysis will occur weekly. Professional development will occur monthly in all content areas in content area literacy strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Content area literacy professional development on student discourse and vocabulary instructional strategies- Literacy site team: monthly
2. Cross-content planning- Core content teachers: monthly
3. Professional development- academic coaches, admin, site team: as needed
4. Viking period implementation
5. Create interdisciplinary literacy team

Person Responsible Rebecca Watson (rebecca.watson@ocps.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:
 Schoolwide PBIS (Walker PRIDE)
 Schoolwide RJ practices
 Schoolwide de-escalation and self-regulation
 SEL activities to strengthen home/school connection

Improvement in EWS indicator data - Suspensions will be reduced by at least 10% from 105 in 2019-2020 to fewer than 95 in 2020-2021.

Measurable Outcome: Other data which will be considered as well is as follows:
 Panorama survey data
 Cognia survey data
 Character Lab Snapshot

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Teresa King (teresa.patterson2@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies
2. Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students

Person Responsible Rebecca Watson (rebecca.watson@ocps.net)

3. Use a process to examine the current school climate and culture
4. Determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school
5. Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture.

Person Responsible Rebecca Watson (rebecca.watson@ocps.net)

6. Understand the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional strategies
7. Use cycle of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning.
8. Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

Person Responsible Rebecca Watson (rebecca.watson@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Walker Middle School provides opportunities for local businesses to interact with families of students at various events for example; Teach-in, STEM night, etc. This builds a mutually beneficial partnership between the school and community and also provides a way for local businesses, such as Wells Fargo, to educate more people about their services and products. This partnership also provides opportunities for community members to participate in campus beautification and mentoring services at Walker Middle School. A Parent and Family Engagement Plan is attached with additional strategies outlined.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Walker Middle School provides opportunities for local businesses to interact with families of students at various events for example; Teach-in, STEM night, etc. This builds a mutually beneficial partnership between the school and community and also provides a way for local businesses, such as Wells Fargo, to educate more people about their services and products. This partnership also provides opportunities for community members to participate in campus beautification and mentoring services at Walker Middle School. A Parent and Family Engagement Plan is attached with additional strategies outlined.

There are multiple levels of services to support the social-emotional needs of all students. Two guidance counselors provide support and counseling to students. For long-term care and support, students can receive counseling services from highly qualified counselors at the Family Service Center located on the school's campus. School counselors may also refer students to local agencies in the community via SEDNET that serve both students and families. Other less intensive counseling and mentoring opportunities are provided through caring teachers, City Year Corps members, Elevate Orlando, the YMCA after-school program, school guidance counselors, school psychologist, school social worker, the school's SAFE coordinator, and school leadership team members. A Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) is a systematic process used to discuss the needs of all students that targets those who are at risk both academically and those who struggle behaviorally; thereby, providing interventions for students who need additional help and support. Students experiencing homelessness are supported through the school guidance counselors. Other organizations that assist in helping needy families include an agency that operates the school's "Love Pantry" through the guidance office. The OCPS Food and Nutrition Services Office provide free meals to our students each school day. Students who participate in the after-school YMCA program also receive dinner.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$32,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1151 - Walker Middle	General Fund		\$15,000.00
			<i>Notes: Notes: Substitute teachers for one planning day per quarter to plan and create common formative assessments.</i>			
	3374	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1151 - Walker Middle	General Fund		\$17,000.00
			<i>Notes: Targeted intervention and extension tutoring for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$32,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3374	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1151 - Walker Middle	General Fund		\$17,000.00
			<i>Notes: Targeted tutoring for lowest 25% in math and ELA</i>			
	3376	140-Substitute Teachers	1151 - Walker Middle	General Fund		\$15,000.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teachers for professional development at FDLRS for working with SWD.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$15,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1151 - Walker Middle	General Fund		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teachers for professional development- CARPD</i>			
	3374	500-Materials and Supplies	1151 - Walker Middle	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Schoolwide journals to develop low stakes writing practices</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$8,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1151 - Walker Middle	General Fund		\$8,000.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teachers for cultural training</i>			
					Total:	\$87,000.00