Garland Independent School District Webb Middle School

2023-2024 Goals/Performance Objectives/Strategies



Mission Statement

Webb Middle School believes that all students can be successful, our mission is to empower ALL students and staff to be responsible citizens who make productive decisions that will foster success in a global society.

Vision

A community of learners who love to read and achieve.

Value Statement

Change is inevitable. Growth is intentional.

Table of Contents

Goals 4

Goal 1: Garland ISD will ensure ALL students graduate prepared for college, careers, and life by increasing student performance measures, postsecondary readiness, and graduation rates and decreasing student management incidences.

Goals

Goal 1: Garland ISD will ensure ALL students graduate prepared for college, careers, and life by increasing student performance measures, postsecondary readiness, and graduation rates and decreasing student management incidences.

Performance Objective 1: Percent of students in grade 6-8 demonstrating early literacy as measured by Meets Grade Level performance on STAAR Reading, will increase to 90% by 2024 for all sub groups. (SY1920 interim goal = 59.0%) Percent of students in grade 6 demonstrating early literacy as measured by Meets Grade Level performance on STAAR Reading, will increase from 28% in 2022 to 33% 2023. Increase Percent of students in grade 7 demonstrating early literacy as measured by Meets Grade Level performance on STAAR Reading, will increase from 44% in 2022 to 49% by 2023. Percent of students in grade 8 demonstrating early literacy as measured by Meets Grade Level performance on STAAR Reading, will increase from 55% in 2022 to 60% in 2023.

Evaluation Data Sources: Interim Assesments, District Benchmarks, STAAR, EOC, MAP

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: 1) Instructional Coach will work with teachers to plan lessons and analyze data to focus on targeted		Formative		Summative
instructional strategies for at-risk students in need of intervention, including WIN targeted intervention students who did not meet performance in previous year STAAR and to meet State compliance.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coach Master schedule created for targeted WIN groups based on students needs.	30%	50%		
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase the academic performance of students who are identified as needing intervention. Improvement will be evaluated through MAP data, CBA data, STAAR results				
Title I:				
2.5, 2.6				
- TEA Priorities:				
Build a foundation of reading and math				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments				
- Targeted Support Strategy				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 4				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: 2) Teachers will identify students who are at risk for not passing STAAR tests based on previous years results		Formative		Summative
and MAP to provide focused intervention for small group tutorials for at risk-students. Students scheduled in WIN cohorts to better meet their academic needs. WIN cohorts will established based on STAAR performance.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, teachers, Instructional Coaches	1004	1204		
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Closing the Gap through daily WIN class, CLC's and weekly data meetings using STAAR, MAP, and demonstration of learning DOL.	10%	40%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments - Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Student Learning 2				
Strategy 3 Details		Revi	iews	
Strategy 3: Teachers will design mini lessons and activities driven by Learning Continuum data to re-teach low performing		Formative		Summative
TEKS measured by unit assessments within a 3 week window following administration of a unit assessment.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Lessons are created where the lower TEKS are spiraled back in for instruction. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase in academic performance, CWT data, WDM notes	20%	45%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities:				

Strategy 4 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 4: 4) Teachers will implement data progress monitoring and tracking to aide in identifying learning gaps and provide data for interventions.		Formative		Summative	
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Data is reviewed in the CLC meetings after the CBA. The agendas can be reviewed for the data. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase purposeful re-teach and interventions through TEK specific lessons based on weekly data meetings. Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4	Nov 25%	Feb 40%	Apr	June	
Strategy 5 Details		Rev	iews		
Strategy 5: Teachers will utilize AVID critical reading strategies using AVID weekly for pre reading, monitoring		Formative		Summative	
comprehension, annotating text, after reading tasks, etc. Teachers will design instruction and they will receive ongoing training on implementing these strategies. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administration, Campus Leadership Team, AVID Coordinators and Site Team AVID weekly was purchased and staff have received training on the reading strategies. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The use of AVID critical reading strategies will result in an increased reading comprehension and analysis. Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments Problem Statements: Student Learning 3	Nov 15%	Feb 40%	Apr	June	

Strategy 6 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 6: Teachers will provide targeted intervention before school to at risk students before-during-after regularly		Formative		Summative	
scheduled school hours using purchased and teacher created materials to address gaps in understanding. Teachers will need instructional materials for extended day purposes (Chromebooks, Folders, whiteboards, dry erase markers, binders, pencils, highlighters, calculators, supplemental materials, teacher created posters, etc.)	Nov	Feb	Apr	June	
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administration, Department Chairs, Teachers Teachers have received the instructional materials that they are using during tutorials, during class and after school. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increased student performance by targeting specific weaknesses in student learning.	20%	45%			
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4 Funding Sources: Supplies - 6300 Supplies and Materials- Title I Funds - \$5,000					
Strategy 7 Details		Rev	iews		
Strategy 7: Teachers will host one hour, weekly computer lab session for students who need cycle recovery, attendance		Formative		Summative	
recovery & jump-start. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administrators and Leadership Team Students have an opportunity for cycle recovery and attendance recovery after school on Thursdays. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Improve failure rates for students Title I:	Nov 20%	Feb 45%	Apr	June	
2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1					

Strategy 8 Details		Rev	iews	
Strategy 8: 9) Teachers will use Measuring Up, Brain-Pop, Lexia Learning, Near-pod-Flocabulary, Motivation Math,	Formative Nov Feb Apr			Summative
Legends of Learning, Education Galaxy and other campus or district purchased materials weekly to supplement gaps or weakness in district reading curriculum and address individual student needs.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administration, Dept. Chairs Programs have been purchased and all core subjects are using the online platforms.	20%	45%		
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Improved access to and use of instructional materials to cover necessary required state knowledge and skills				
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities:				
Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments				
- Targeted Support Strategy				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 2				
Funding Sources: Funding for Online Platforms - 6300 Supplies and Materials- Title I Funds - \$15,747				
Strategy 9 Details		Rev	iews	
Strategy 9: Staff will be given the opportunity to participate in professional development at the district, regional or state to		Formative		Summative
improve/understand the district/campus goal initiatives that will impact student growth.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administrators Counselors just recently attended LSSA conference. I will also be attending a parental conference in December.	2004	1004		
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increased student performance by giving teachers increased knowledge about content skills and strategies.	20%	40%		
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities:				
Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments - Targeted Support Strategy				
Tui Secon Support StrateSy				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 2				

Strategy 10 Details		Revi	iews	
Strategy 10: Administrators and teachers will use the MAP learning continuum data for math to embed Tier 1 intervention		Formative		Summative
support across all core content areas to accelerate learning.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers, Administrators, Instructional Coach				
MAP data was used to Tier students and change groups if needed.	15%	45%		
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: BOY, MOY, EOY student growth				
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6				
- TEA Priorities:				
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing				
schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments - Targeted Support Strategy				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 3				
S44		David		
Strategy 11 Details		Revi	iews	1
Strategy 11: In order to increase students participation for academic learning and student engagement with multiple response strategies in classrooms. Students will need whiteboard desks to record responses and teachers will provide	Formative			Summative
feedback to students. Having whiteboard desk will provide a safe way to elicit multiple response strategies and support	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
overall student learning.				
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased ways to respond	10%	45%		
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: To increase ways for teachers to gather responses in class for students.				
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6				
- TEA Priorities:				
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments				
- Targeted Support Strategy				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3				
	X Discon			
No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 1) Our Weakness is social studies. Our campus has an average of 38% approaches compared to the state's average of 57%. 2) 7th grade mathematics performed at 22% compared to the state average of 55%. 3) Only 9% of African American students were successful on 7th grade mathematics compared to their Hispanic (23%), White (38%), and Asian (33%) peers. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 2: According to campus STAAR summary reports for 0% of African American, Hispanic, and Special Education students achieved Meets on the grade 7 mathematics. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 3: One weakness is our Hispanic performance on EBRW and Math PSAT. Only 16% of our Hispanic population met Benchmark. An additional weakness is our African American populations' performance. Only 9% met Benchmark in EBRW and Math PSAT combined. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 4: According to campus STAAR summary reports for mathematics, performance for African American students in 6th, 7th and 8th grades is significantly lower than other subgroups. in approaches meets and masters. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Performance Objective 2: Percent of students in grade 7 demonstrating early literacy as measured by Meets Grade Level performance on STAAR Writing, will increase from 46% in 2022 to 70% by 2023 for all sub groups.

Spring 2022 STAAR Campus Performance: Meets 46% and District Meets Performance 51%

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP, Interim Assesments, District Benchmarks, STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: 1) Teachers will implement writer's workshop to include a mini-lesson, independent writing, coaching/		Formative		Summative
conferencing, and sharing weekly in class. adding journal entries daily in class after attending professional development training.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach, teachers Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase in achievement utilizing writing samples, and purposeful planning.	15%	25%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1				

Strategy 2 Details		Reviews		
Strategy 2: 2) Instructional coach will work collaboratively with ELAR teachers on strategies to implement in the		Formative		Summative
classroom to increase student engagement.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach			•	
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase in achievement utilizing writing samples, and purposeful planning.	20%	40%		
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6				
- TEA Priorities:				
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing				
schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 5: Effective Instruction				
- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1				
Strategy 3 Details		Revi	ews	_
Strategy 3: 3) Teachers will implement data progress monitoring and tracking to aide in identifying learning gaps and		Formative		Summative
				<u> </u>
provide data for interventions.	Nov	Feb	Anr	June
provide data for interventions. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach			Apr	June
	Nov	Feb 40%	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach			Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Closing learning gaps that are reveled			Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Closing learning gaps that are reveled Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities:			Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Closing learning gaps that are reveled Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools			Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Closing learning gaps that are reveled Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers:			Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Closing learning gaps that are reveled Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction			Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Closing learning gaps that are reveled Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability			Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Closing learning gaps that are reveled Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction			Apr	June

Strategy 4 Details		Revi	iews	
Strategy 4: 4) All core teachers will participate in campus performance planning days in the fall and spring to plan	Formative			Summative
instruction, develop materials and analyze data. Teachers will also have an opportunity to plan after school. Performance planning will be facilitated by the administrators and the instructional coach. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administration, Department Chairs, Teachers	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase CBA data results, purposeful planning, create instructional planning calendars	10%	35%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4				
No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify	X Discon	tinue		

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 1) Our Weakness is social studies. Our campus has an average of 38% approaches compared to the state's average of 57%. 2) 7th grade mathematics performed at 22% compared to the state average of 55%. 3) Only 9% of African American students were successful on 7th grade mathematics compared to their Hispanic (23%), White (38%), and Asian (33%) peers. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 2: According to campus STAAR summary reports for 0% of African American, Hispanic, and Special Education students achieved Meets on the grade 7 mathematics. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 3: One weakness is our Hispanic performance on EBRW and Math PSAT. Only 16% of our Hispanic population met Benchmark. An additional weakness is our African American populations' performance. Only 9% met Benchmark in EBRW and Math PSAT combined. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 4: According to campus STAAR summary reports for mathematics, performance for African American students in 6th, 7th and 8th grades is significantly lower than other subgroups. in approaches meets and masters. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Performance Objective 3: Percent of EB students demonstrating English language acquisition, as measured by earning yearly progress indicator on the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS), will increase from 37.5% in 2019 to 76% by 2025. (SY2021 interim goal = 46.0%) Due to COVID 19-Pandemic, TELPAS data is not accurate.

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP, TELPAS Practice, Interim Assesments

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: 1) Teachers will provide Sheltered Instruction through a differentiated classroom that is focused (specifically		Formative		Summative
emphasizing English language development) targeted and systematic in developing English language skills. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach, LPAC lead teacher Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase in achievement utilizing purposeful planning and Ellevation strategies for the classroom.	Nov 10%	Feb 30%	Apr	June
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Administrators and teachers will ensure that each EB is provided with linguistic and instructional		Formative		Summative
accommodations as determined by the LPAC	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administration, Dept. Chairs, LPAC Lead Teacher Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ELL provided with instructional and linguistic accommodations to assist in obtaining English Language proficiency.	15%	35%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 1				
Strategy 3 Details		Rev	iews	
Strategy 3: The English Language Proficiency Standards will be implemented into instruction daily to make content comprehensible and develop academic language.	N T	Formative	A	Summative
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administration, Dept. Chairs, LPAC Lead Teacher Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Comprehensible content and campus wide use of academic language development. Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 3	Nov 10%	Feb 35%	Apr	June

Strategy 4 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 4: Teachers will use EB instructional materials and strategies such as anchor charts, sentence stems, word walls,		Formative		Summative	
etc. to improve comprehension of content and academic language development. Teachers will receive ongoing campus training on design and implementation of these strategies.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June	
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administration, Dept. Chairs, LPAC Lead Teacher Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Print rich environment will result in increased comprehension and academic language development.	15%	40%			
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4					
Strategy 5 Details		Revi	iews		
Strategy 5: Administrators and teachers will identify student English Language Proficiency levels using ELLevation and		Formative		Summative	
determine students' level of language support needed based on the Proficiency Language Descriptors (PLDs)	Nov	Feb	Apr	June	
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administration, Dept. Chairs, LPAC Lead Teacher Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers will provide students targeted language acquisition instruction to ensure EL students demonstrate one year's growth in their language development	10%	30%			
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4					

Strategy 6 Details				
Strategy 6: Administrators and teachers will ensure that each EL (English Learner) is provided with linguistic and		Formative		Summative
instructional accommodations as determined by the LPAC. (i.e. Intial LPAC, Assessment LPAC, Monitoring Intervention LPAC, EOY LPAC) Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administrators	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Growth on TELPAS	10%	30%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 2				
No Progress Continue/Modify	X Discon	tinue		

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 1) Our Weakness is social studies. Our campus has an average of 38% approaches compared to the state's average of 57%. 2) 7th grade mathematics performed at 22% compared to the state average of 55%. 3) Only 9% of African American students were successful on 7th grade mathematics compared to their Hispanic (23%), White (38%), and Asian (33%) peers. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 2: According to campus STAAR summary reports for 0% of African American, Hispanic, and Special Education students achieved Meets on the grade 7 mathematics. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 3: One weakness is our Hispanic performance on EBRW and Math PSAT. Only 16% of our Hispanic population met Benchmark. An additional weakness is our African American populations' performance. Only 9% met Benchmark in EBRW and Math PSAT combined. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 4: According to campus STAAR summary reports for mathematics, performance for African American students in 6th, 7th and 8th grades is significantly lower than other subgroups. in approaches meets and masters. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Performance Objective 4: Percent of students in grade 8 demonstrating scientific understanding as measured by Meets Grade Level performance on STAAR Science, from 42% in 2022 to 47% in 2023 and to 80% by 2025. (SY2022 interim goal = 51.0%) Increase the meets percent on the 2023 Social Studies STAAR exam to 35% for Hispanic, African American, Asian and White students.

Evaluation Data Sources: Interim Assessments, District Benchmarks, STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Science and social studies teachers will plan hands on lessons that extend the district curriculum. They will		Formative		Summative
implement daily journal activities along with hands-on instructional activities to promote collaboration during small group instruction.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach, LPAC lead teacher Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increasing student engagement through purposeful planning.	10%	25%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments - Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Student Learning 1				

Strategy 2 Details		Rev	iews	
Strategy 2: Teachers will implement data progress monitoring and tracking to aide in identifying learning gaps and provide		Formative		Summative
data for interventions. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, Teachers and Instructional Coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase purposeful re-teach and interventions through TEK specific lessons based on weekly data meetings. Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning Problem Statements: Student Learning 1	Nov	Feb 35%	Apr	June
Strategy 3 Details		Rev	iews	
Strategy 3: Science and Social Studies teachers will focus on Closing the Gaps for ELL and SPED students with visual		Formative		Summative
vocabulary for each unit.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase performance for sub-populations. Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	10%	40%	1	

Strategy 4 Details				
Strategy 4: Science and Social Studies teachers will utilize newly purchased programs to supplement gaps or weakness in		Formative		Summative
the curriculum and address individual student needs.Legends of Learning, Education Galazy, Explore Learning-Gizmos.	Nov	Feb	Feb Apr	
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Improved access to and use of instructional materials to cover necessary required state knowledge and skills	N/A	30%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 Funding Sources: Online Platforms - 6300 Supplies and Materials- Title I Funds				
Funding Sources: Online Platforms - 6300 Supplies and Materials- Title I Funds No Progress Continue/Modify	X Disco	ntinue		

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 1) Our Weakness is social studies. Our campus has an average of 38% approaches compared to the state's average of 57%. 2) 7th grade mathematics performed at 22% compared to the state average of 55%. 3) Only 9% of African American students were successful on 7th grade mathematics compared to their Hispanic (23%), White (38%), and Asian (33%) peers. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 2: According to campus STAAR summary reports for 0% of African American, Hispanic, and Special Education students achieved Meets on the grade 7 mathematics. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Performance Objective 5: Percent of students demonstrating mathematical proficiency, as measured by Meets Grade Level performance by the end of grade 9 on STAAR Algebra 1 EOC will remain at 100% by 2025 for all student groups. Percent of students demonstrating mathematical proficiency, as measured by Meets Grade Level performance on STAAR Mathematics for 6th grade will increase from 23% in 2022 to 41% in 2023. Percent of students demonstrating mathematical proficiency, as measured by Meets Grade Level performance on STAAR Mathematics for 7th grade will increase from 16% in 2022 to 48% in 2023. Percent of students demonstrating mathematical proficiency, as measured by Meets Grade Level performance on STAAR Mathematics for 8th grade will increase from 70% in 2022 to 90% in 2023.

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP, Interim Assessments, District Benchmarks, STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will create classroom environments that are collaborative in nature to create more opportunities for		Formative		Summative
small group activities, while incorporating AVID strategies.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators and AVID coordinator.			-	
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Improve collaboration among student's, that will result in an increase of engagement and retention of information.	5%	40%		
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6				
- TEA Priorities:				
Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 5: Effective Instruction				
Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details		Rev	iews	
Strategy 2: Teachers will implement data progress monitoring and tracking to aide in identifying learning gaps and provide		Formative		
data for interventions.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach	1101	100	P-	
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase purposeful re-teach and interventions through TEK specific lessons based on weekly data meetings.	15%	40%		
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6				
- TEA Priorities:				
Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction				
Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1				
Strategy 3 Details		Rev	iews	<u> </u>
Strategy 3: Administrators and teachers will use the MAP learning continuum data for math to embed Tier 1 intervention	Formative			Summativ
support across all core content areas to accelerate learning.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers, Administrators, instructional coach	1101	Teb	Apı	June
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: BOY, MOY, EOY student growth	20%	35%		
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6				
- TEA Priorities:				
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1				
No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify	X Discon			1

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 1) Our Weakness is social studies. Our campus has an average of 38% approaches compared to the state's average of 57%. 2) 7th grade mathematics performed at 22% compared to the state average of 55%. 3) Only 9% of African American students were successful on 7th grade mathematics compared to their Hispanic (23%), White (38%), and Asian (33%) peers. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Based on data from parents and teachers engagement survey, Teachers should introduce more resources to provide parents with support in helping their children succeed at home. **Root Cause**: Lack of parent and teacher communication to explain changes to instructional model (F2F and Remote learning), Confusion with canvas; challenges with Asynchrounos work.

Performance Objective 6: Percent of students demonstrating post-secondary readiness exam success, as measured by meeting college ready benchmarks through PSAT School Day Evidence-based Reading & Writing will increase from 49.5% in 2019 to 70% in by 2025 and PSAT School Day Mathematics will increase from 29.2% in 2019 to 50% by 2025.

Evaluation Data Sources: PSAT DATA

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Counseling dept will host a career/college fair that will allow students to gain more knowledge on the		Formative		Summative
advantages of taking more rigorous course work that will promote students to take more Pre-AP and AP level courses. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase in the number rigorous course selection. Title I: 2.4, 2.5 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments - Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	Nov 20%	Feb 45%	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details		Rev	iews	
Strategy 2: Teachers will incorporate AVID strategies such as AVID binders and WICOR campus wide to aide students in developing the necessary skills to reach mastery in all content. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administration Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase in student organization and rigorous content in all classes. Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools	Nov 15%	Formative Feb	Apr	Summative June

Strategy 3 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 3: Identified 8th grade students will participate in a 4 hour PSAT prep session prior to the PSAT. Students will be		Formative		Summative	
identified and invited through 7th grade Reading/Writing STAAR scores in Reading and Math. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administration, Dept. Chairs, Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PSAT data improvement in Reading and Math. Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 3	Nov 10%	Feb 35%	Apr	June	
Strategy 4 Details		Revi	iews		
Strategy 4: Staff will participate in on campus professional development of CHAMPS classroom management system which will be incorporated campus wide. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators and teachers Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Decrease in the number of referrals. Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Perceptions 1	Nov 20%	Feb 40%	Apr	Summative June	

Strategy 5 Details				
Strategy 5: Administrative teams will analyze data monthly to monitor and assess progress of discipline data at the end of		Summative		
the six weeks. Discipline data will be communicated to staff quarterly and plans for students in need of behavioral interventions will be created.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administrators, Counselors, Teachers Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Decrease in the number of exclusionary referrals.	20%	35%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Perceptions 1				
No Progress Continue/Modify	X Discon	tinue		•

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: According to campus STAAR summary reports for 0% of African American, Hispanic, and Special Education students achieved Meets on the grade 7 mathematics. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 3: One weakness is our Hispanic performance on EBRW and Math PSAT. Only 16% of our Hispanic population met Benchmark. An additional weakness is our African American populations' performance. Only 9% met Benchmark in EBRW and Math PSAT combined. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: In a survey students describe as "ghetto" Students do not have a lot of school pride. Garland tries to do too much of the same accros the board-but it doesnt fit our school and student pop. "Webb has no money, and Garland has no money" **Root Cause**: Follow through on systems for ex. PBIS, dress code, how to identify discipline issues with out seeming like a prison. Hanging more stuff in the halls, pride in school and spirit, student work posted. The kids dont respect the campus and others dont respect it, drawings etc... students feed off the teachers perceptions and copy those emotions.

Performance Objective 7: Percent of student management incidents resulting in exclusionary consequences [i.e., In School Suspension (ISS), Out of School Suspension (OSS), and Reassignment Rooms] will decrease from 36% in 2022 to 35% by 2025. (SY2022 interim goal = 44.0%)

The 22-23 school year ended with 25% total exclusionary consequences (960 out of 3,845) compared to 35% last year (1,012 out of 2,897). There was also about 100 less disciplinary incidents this year compared to last year.

The 22-23 school year ended with a 40% reduction in Fights. In 22/23 we had 60 total students involved in fights. In 21/22 we had 102 students involved in fights. The fight prevention plan which was established at the beginning of the school year and communicated to students assisted with ensuring the reduction in fights at the campus.

Evaluation Data Sources: Review 360 discipline reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Campus staff will review behavioral data and develop a school wide student management plan to address		Formative		Summative
specific targeted behavior, a positive behavior support plan that promotes positive behavior in all aspects of the school setting and to determine interventions to be utilized to prevent misconduct.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators and PBIS team				
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Decrease in exclusionary consequences.	15%	35%		
Title I:				
2.5				
- TEA Priorities:				
Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 3: Positive School Culture				
- Targeted Support Strategy				
Problem Statements: Perceptions 1				
No Progress Continue/Modify	X Discon	<u> </u> tinue		

Performance Objective 7 Problem Statements:

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: In a survey students describe as "ghetto" Students do not have a lot of school pride. Garland tries to do too much of the same accros the board-but it doesnt fit our school and student pop. "Webb has no money, and Garland has no money" **Root Cause**: Follow through on systems for ex. PBIS, dress code, how to identify discipline issues with out seeming like a prison. Hanging more stuff in the halls, pride in school and spirit, student work posted. The kids dont respect the campus and others dont respect it, drawings etc... students feed off the teachers perceptions and copy those emotions.

Performance Objective 8: By June 2024, Webb will establish a variety of parental and community partnerships with various stakeholders, including families, to provide services that support student achievement and school improvement.

The campus incorporated several community and parental partnerships for th 22-23 school year. Webb Middle School collaborated with North Texas Food Bank to provide boxed food items to families and the community. Other on campus events that provided an opportunity to foster parental relationships included multicultural night, open house, and parent/teacher conferences.

Evaluation Data Sources: Opportunities for business & community to be involved with Webb.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Webb Middle School will increase to three per year the number of opportunities for the parental involvement		Formative		Summative
with Webb school-wide, including the Cub Paw Awards, recognition and Perot Math/Science Family Night, Career Week, Awards Night, Steamposium, Avid information/interest night, parent workshops, and Social Emotional Learning workshop	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
and 6th grade orientation. Healthy snacks will be provided during the events.				
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administrators and Campus Leadership Team (CLT) Members	20%	35%		
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increased parental involvement, student success recognition, College, Career &				
Military Readiness				
Title I:				
2.4, 4.2				
- TEA Priorities:				
Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 3: Positive School Culture				
- Targeted Support Strategy				
Problem Statements: Perceptions 1, 2				
Funding Sources: - 6100 Parent Inv. Payroll T1 - \$5,400				

Strategy 2 Details		Rev	iews	
Strategy 2: Support transition to middle school for 5th graders moving to 6th grade and 8th going to 9th by holding		Formative		Summative
Transition meetings for families in collaboration with feeder schools to provide information on graduation plans, and college and career readiness	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administrators and Campus Leadership Team (CLT) Members Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Transitional programs.	45%	60%		
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 4.1 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 2 Funding Sources: Payroll for Transition Planning & Working - 6100 Payroll- Title I Funds - \$3,000				
Strategy 3 Details		Rev	iews	•
Strategy 3: Provide PD opportunities for staff and parents on best practices to create a culturally competent and inclusive		Formative		Summative
environment for families	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administrators Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Parents will participate in a survey and professional development sessions will be created for parents to participate and attend.	50%	60%		
Title I: 2.4, 4.1, 4.2 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Perceptions 1, 2				

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: Parents will have opportunities to learn about school performance data, state academic standards, current levels of student achievement, and strategies for supporting student learning at home.	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administrators				
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Parental nights for families to address academic standards.	30%	55%		
Title I:				
4.1, 4.2				
- TEA Priorities:				
Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 3: Positive School Culture				
Problem Statements: Perceptions 1, 2				
Funding Sources: Talking Points & Paper, Classkick, Gimkit, Blooket - 6300 Parent Involvement. Supplies T1 - \$10,000				
No Progress Continue/Modify	X Discon	tinue		

Performance Objective 8 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 1) Our Weakness is social studies. Our campus has an average of 38% approaches compared to the state's average of 57%. 2) 7th grade mathematics performed at 22% compared to the state average of 55%. 3) Only 9% of African American students were successful on 7th grade mathematics compared to their Hispanic (23%), White (38%), and Asian (33%) peers. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 2: According to campus STAAR summary reports for 0% of African American, Hispanic, and Special Education students achieved Meets on the grade 7 mathematics. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 3: One weakness is our Hispanic performance on EBRW and Math PSAT. Only 16% of our Hispanic population met Benchmark. An additional weakness is our African American populations' performance. Only 9% met Benchmark in EBRW and Math PSAT combined. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 4: According to campus STAAR summary reports for mathematics, performance for African American students in 6th, 7th and 8th grades is significantly lower than other subgroups. in approaches meets and masters. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Based on data from parents and teachers engagement survey, Teachers should introduce more resources to provide parents with support in helping their children succeed at home. **Root Cause**: Lack of parent and teacher communication to explain changes to instructional model (F2F and Remote learning), Confusion with canvas; challenges with Asynchrounos work.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: In a survey students describe as "ghetto" Students do not have a lot of school pride. Garland tries to do too much of the same accros the board-but it doesnt fit our school and student pop. "Webb has no money, and Garland has no money" **Root Cause**: Follow through on systems for ex. PBIS, dress code, how to identify discipline issues with out seeming like a prison. Hanging more stuff in the halls, pride in school and spirit, student work posted. The kids dont respect the campus and others dont respect it, drawings etc... students feed off the teachers perceptions and copy those emotions.

Problem Statement 2: Family Engagement in general- low parent involvement Consistent Comminucation Procedures to families/Weekly updates with more detail Root Cause: lack of community outreach to promote PTA, lack of access to school due to pandemic.

Performance Objective 9: FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY (Targeted School of Improvement): Due to one or more consistently under-performing student group in 2019 accountability, STAAR student performance in the following areas need to increase to meet the student performance targets:

All Students: Mathematics Academic Achievement from 41 (2019) to at least 46 (min target)

All Students: Mathematics Growth from 65 (2019) to at least 71 (min target)

All Students: Student Success (D1 STAAR Component) from 44 (2019) to at least 47 (min target)

Hispanic Students: Mathematics Academic Achievement from 31 (2019) to at least 40 (min target)

Hispanic Students: Mathematics Growth from 60 (2019) to at least 69 (min target)

Hispanic Students: Student Success (D1 STAAR Component) from 38 (2019) to at least 41 (min target)

White Students: Reading Academic Achievement from 46 (2019) to at least 60 (min target)

White Students: Mathematics Academic Achievement from 43 (2019) to at least 59 (min target)

White Students: Reading Growth from 60 (2019) to at least 69 (min target)

White Students: Mathematics Growth from 64 (2019) to at least 74 (min target)

White Students: Student Success (D1 STAAR Component) from 47 (2019) to at least 58 (min target)

Asian Students: Reading Academic Achievement from 60 (2019) to at least 74 (min target)

Asian Students: Mathematics Academic Achievement from 74 (2019) to at least 82 (min target)

Asian Students: Mathematics Growth from 81 (2019) to at least 86 (min target)

Asian Students: Student Success (D1 STAAR Component) from 64 (2019) to at least 73 (min target)

Evaluation Data Sources: BOY, MOY, EOY student growth, CBA Data, and Interim Assessments.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will identify students who are at	Formative			Summative
risk for not passing STAAR tests based on	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
previous years results and MAP to provide	1101	100	1101	June
focused intervention for small group				
tutorials for at risk-students.	20%	45%		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, teachers, Instructional Coach				
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Closing the Gap through weekly data meetings using STAAR, MAP, and demonstration of learning DOL.				
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6				
- TEA Priorities:				
Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 5: Effective Instruction				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Teachers will implement data progress monitoring and tracking to aide in identifying learning gaps and provide	Formative			Summative
data for interventions.	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach and teachers	1101	100	1101	- June
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase purposeful re-teach and interventions through TEK specific lessons based on weekly data meetings.	20%	45%		
Title I:				
2.4, 2.5, 2.6				
- TEA Priorities:				
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools				
- ESF Levers:				
Lever 5: Effective Instruction				
- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4				
No Progress Accomplished — Continue/Modify	X Discon	, -		•

Performance Objective 9 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 1) Our Weakness is social studies. Our campus has an average of 38% approaches compared to the state's average of 57%. 2) 7th grade mathematics performed at 22% compared to the state average of 55%. 3) Only 9% of African American students were successful on 7th grade mathematics compared to their Hispanic (23%), White (38%), and Asian (33%) peers. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 2: According to campus STAAR summary reports for 0% of African American, Hispanic, and Special Education students achieved Meets on the grade 7 mathematics. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 3: One weakness is our Hispanic performance on EBRW and Math PSAT. Only 16% of our Hispanic population met Benchmark. An additional weakness is our African American populations' performance. Only 9% met Benchmark in EBRW and Math PSAT combined. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 4: According to campus STAAR summary reports for mathematics, performance for African American students in 6th, 7th and 8th grades is significantly lower than other subgroups. in approaches meets and masters. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Performance Objective 10: STATE ACCOUNTABILITY (D Domain Rating): Due to a 2019 accountability rating of D in the following domain(s), STAAR student performance in the corresponding areas need to increase to meet the domain performance targets:

Closing Gaps Domain performance will increase from a weighted score of 24 (scale score of 67/D) to at least a weighted score of 28 (scale score of 70/C).

For the 21-22 school year Webb Middle School scored an accountability rating of B.

Webb Middle School scored a "B," 83 out of 100, on its overall rating. Webb had an overall growth of 5 points from its last rating in the 2018-2019 school year and was able to move up a full rating.

Webb Middle School received a "C," 75 out of 100 for Domain 1: Student Achievement during the 2021-2022 school year. The "C" in Domain 1 scored by Webb means that at least 38% of students met grade level on the STAAR. According to current TEA data, Webb across all subjects Webb only has approximately 39% of students meeting Grade level.

Webb Middle School received a "B," 85 out of 100, for Domain 2: School Progress for the 2021-2022 school year which is up 2 pts from the previous year. The relative performance rating for Webb was higher when compared to similar schools with our same poverty levels.

Webb Middle School scored a "C," 78 out of 100, for Domain 3: Closing the Gaps for the 2021-2022 school year, which equates to 28% or more of student groups have met state goals. This shows "acceptable work" at closing gaps between groups. Based on all Demographic groups, Academic Growth and Growth status was only met in ELA/ Reading.

Evaluation Data Sources: Federal accountability data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will implement data progress monitoring and tracking to aide in identifying learning gaps and provide data for interventions. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators, instructional coach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Increase purposeful re-teach and interventions through TEK specific lessons based on weekly data meetings.	Formative			Summative			
	Nov F	Feb	Feb Apr	June			
	30%	50%					
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4							
No Progress Continue/Modify	X Discon	tinue					

Performance Objective 10 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 1) Our Weakness is social studies. Our campus has an average of 38% approaches compared to the state's average of 57%. 2) 7th grade mathematics performed at 22% compared to the state average of 55%. 3) Only 9% of African American students were successful on 7th grade mathematics compared to their Hispanic (23%), White (38%), and Asian (33%) peers. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 2: According to campus STAAR summary reports for 0% of African American, Hispanic, and Special Education students achieved Meets on the grade 7 mathematics. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 3: One weakness is our Hispanic performance on EBRW and Math PSAT. Only 16% of our Hispanic population met Benchmark. An additional weakness is our African American populations' performance. Only 9% met Benchmark in EBRW and Math PSAT combined. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity

Problem Statement 4: According to campus STAAR summary reports for mathematics, performance for African American students in 6th, 7th and 8th grades is significantly lower than other subgroups. in approaches meets and masters. **Root Cause**: Instructional approach and delivery, relational capacity