

Pasco County Schools

Thomas E. Weightman Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Thomas E. Weightman Middle School

30649 WELLS RD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33545

<https://tewms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Donna Gricoski

Start Date for this Principal: 3/9/2017

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 42% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: B (59%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| ESSA Status | TS&I |
|--|------|
| * 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 Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Thomas E. Weightman Middle School

30649 WELLS RD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33545

<https://tewms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | No | 48% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 55% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | B | B |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Thomas E. Weightman Middle School will offer a nurturing and safe environment that provides an academic focus, values diversity, and challenges all students to achieve their full potential with the support of its home, staff, university, and community partnerships.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All our students achieve success in college, career, and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Fowler, Rachel | Principal | Instructional Leader |
| Johnson, Laurie | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader |
| Mira, Andressa | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader |
| Abercrombie, Freda | Teacher, K-12 | 7th & 8th grade ELA Gifted Teacher |
| Beagle, Jessica | Instructional Coach | Learning Design Coach |
| Benson, Stephanie | Teacher, Career/ Technical | Agricultural Science Teacher |
| Britton, Frank | Teacher, K-12 | 7th Science teacher |
| Cross, Zachary | Teacher, K-12 | 8th Social Studies Teacher, MTSS Committee |
| Eads, Heather | Teacher, K-12 | 6th ELA Teacher |
| Garcia, Angela | Teacher, ESE | ESE Teacher: Co-teach & Support Facilitation, ESE Department Head |
| Irving, Alana | School Counselor | School Counselor |
| Meyer, Shari | Teacher, K-12 | 6th Gifted Science Teacher |
| Monticco, Lesllie | Teacher, ESE | ASD- ASBCP teacher |
| Parrish, Christine | Teacher, K-12 | Civics teacher |
| Pedersen, Cassandra | Teacher, K-12 | 8th Science teacher |
| Riordan, Tricia | Teacher, K-12 | 8th Social Studies teacher |
| Stallings, Donna | Teacher, K-12 | Geometry, Algebra & Pre-Algebra teacher |
| Valeski, Joy | Teacher, K-12 | Reading Teacher: Intensive reading |

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 | 360 | 399 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1158 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 38 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 62 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 80 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229 | |

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 | 35 | 53 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

62

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/7/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Attendance below 90 percent | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| One or more suspensions | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 65% | 52% | 54% | 62% | 50% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 60% | 55% | 54% | 57% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 47% | 47% | 42% | 40% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 69% | 60% | 58% | 60% | 53% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 69% | 61% | 57% | 57% | 58% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 62% | 52% | 51% | 50% | 48% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 65% | 52% | 51% | 61% | 45% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 84% | 68% | 72% | 76% | 70% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 360 (0) | 399 (0) | 399 (0) | 1158 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 () | 17 () | 17 () | 45 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 37 () | 38 () | 38 () | 113 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 73 () | 62 () | 62 () | 197 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 69 () | 80 () | 80 () | 229 (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.

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 64% | 56% | 8% | 54% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 51% | 10% | 52% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 59% | 51% | 8% | 52% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 51% | 12% | 51% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 67% | 58% | 9% | 56% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 58% | 6% | 58% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 60% | 59% | 1% | 55% | 5% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 53% | 2% | 52% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 37% | 42% | -5% | 54% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 44% | 8% | 54% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -18% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 79% | 68% | 11% | 46% | 33% |
| | 2018 | 75% | 63% | 12% | 45% | 30% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 27% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 62% | 54% | 8% | 48% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 53% | 4% | 50% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| 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 | 82% | 70% | 12% | 71% | 11% |
| 2018 | 72% | 71% | 1% | 71% | 1% |
| Compare | | 10% | | | |
| 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 | 99% | 60% | 39% | 61% | 38% |
| 2018 | 98% | 63% | 35% | 62% | 36% |
| Compare | | 1% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 62% | 38% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 56% | -56% |
| Compare | | 100% | | | |

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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 27 | 39 | 32 | 31 | 49 | 45 | 31 | 49 | 30 | | |
| ELL | 16 | 47 | 43 | 22 | 42 | 44 | 7 | 76 | | | |
| ASN | 69 | 60 | | 83 | 79 | | 86 | 100 | 93 | | |
| BLK | 64 | 62 | 47 | 57 | 68 | 60 | 67 | 75 | 65 | | |
| HSP | 55 | 55 | 45 | 56 | 62 | 57 | 58 | 85 | 38 | | |
| MUL | 74 | 60 | 70 | 86 | 69 | | 69 | 86 | 54 | | |
| WHT | 72 | 63 | 51 | 79 | 73 | 72 | 68 | 84 | 53 | | |
| FRL | 56 | 58 | 48 | 59 | 65 | 60 | 54 | 76 | 33 | | |
| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 29 | 54 | 48 | 32 | 61 | 57 | 32 | 42 | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 50 | 38 | 45 | 72 | 94 | | 35 | | | |
| ASN | 80 | 84 | | 86 | 82 | | 80 | 92 | | | |
| BLK | 51 | 56 | 52 | 47 | 57 | 51 | 42 | 69 | 40 | | |
| HSP | 60 | 60 | 48 | 63 | 71 | 74 | 53 | 71 | 49 | | |

| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| MUL | 64 | 71 | | 78 | 80 | | 62 | 82 | 50 | | |
| WHT | 68 | 61 | 53 | 72 | 73 | 66 | 69 | 73 | 72 | | |
| FRL | 56 | 61 | 52 | 58 | 68 | 66 | 51 | 64 | 44 | | |
| 2017 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 | 21 | 39 | 34 | 19 | 38 | 36 | 39 | 35 | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 40 | 30 | 28 | 32 | 7 | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | 67 | | 88 | 75 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | 57 | 53 | 51 | 52 | 52 | 54 | 62 | 59 | | |
| HSP | 53 | 52 | 40 | 53 | 55 | 47 | 59 | 75 | 43 | | |
| MUL | 48 | 45 | | 46 | 37 | | 25 | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 60 | 41 | 65 | 60 | 54 | 65 | 79 | 63 | | |
| FRL | 50 | 51 | 43 | 50 | 52 | 49 | 47 | 64 | 48 | | |

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 | 64 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 60 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 635 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 37 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 40 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 81 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 63 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 71 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 68 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 57 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

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.

SWD 27% ELA Ach. (39% LGs)
 ELL 16% ELA Ach. (47% LGs)
 New ESE ELA teacher, many students are ELL & SWD

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

7th Math: large ESE population in this cohort, challenging standards within the grade level course, had two interns in this grade for 2nd semester

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.

Science Ach: TEWMS +24%; teachers work in PLCs with common formative assessments, adjusted instruction to meet students needs, develop growth/learning atmosphere in classrooms
 7th Math Ach: TEWMS - 17%; large ESE population in this cohort, challenging standards within the grade level course, had two interns in this grade for 2nd semester

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

Civics w/ +10%; teachers work in PLCs with common formative assessments, adjusted instruction to meet students needs, develop growth/learning atmosphere in classrooms
 8th Math Cohort w/ +27%; teachers work in PLCs with common formative assessments, adjusted instruction to meet students needs, develop growth/learning atmosphere in classrooms

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

- 1) Number of level 1 on state assessment
- 2) Number of students with failing ELA/Math course

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

1. Basic skills in Math: multiplication facts which support increase awareness of number sense.
2. Align writing expectations and rubrics in 6, 7, & 8th ELA.
3. Provide focused instruction for students who need Tier 2 (more of core) support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

| | |
|---|---|
| Title | Align ELA Writing expectations/rubrics |
| Rationale | If teachers have a consistent structure & rubric they model for writing, then more time is devoted to students deepening their learning on the craft of writing. When all grade levels are consistent with the progressive expectations of writing, less time is spent teaching format/structure. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | ELA Learning gains will increase by 5% according to the 2020 FSA ELA. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Laurie Johnson (lmjohnso@pasco.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Work with ELA department to develop conscience on what is expected of a 6th, 7th & 8th grade with regards to student writing. Decide on what writing strategies will be used in all ELA classrooms. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | When all teachers are using the same writing strategies and grading rubric, teachers are able to compare data and make shifts in instruction that match the student needs. In addition, students are not having to learn a new approach to writing every year, which can be confusing and increase frustration. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine what writing strategies and grading rubric will be used in all ELA classrooms. 2. Develop conscience on writing expectations for each grade level. 3. PLCs work with student data to determine effectiveness of strategies and areas in which students need additional support (Tier 2). |
| Person Responsible | Laurie Johnson (lmjohnso@pasco.k12.fl.us) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Tier 2 instruction (more of core) |
| Rationale | Students learn at different rates, have different amounts of prior knowledge and come into courses with gaps in their learning from previous course work. In efforts to increase student mastery of standards, teachers need to have time and instructional strategies to provide student with additional leanings. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The number of students failing core courses will reduce by 5% according to the EWS. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Rachel Fowler (rzick@pasco.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Develop, design and implement school wide structure to allow students additional time for T2 support (more core) through priority days of study hall time. PLCs will identify and monitor essential standards (at least one per semester) ensuring that 100% of students demonstrate mastery of standard. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Students need more time on focused instruction when they have gaps in their learning. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PLCs will develop common formative and summative assessments for the essential standard(s). 2. PLCs work with student data to determine effectiveness of strategies and areas in which students need additional support (Tier 2). 3. PLCs will intentionally plan for students who need more instruction to demonstrate master of the essential standard(s). 4. PLCs will determine how they will provide T2 support (more core) to students who did not demonstrate mastery of the essential standard(s). 5. PLCs will use T2 time to provide T2 supports to students |
| Person Responsible | Rachel Fowler (rzick@pasco.k12.fl.us) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

see areas of focus

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Align ELA Writing expectations/rubrics | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|--|--------|

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Tier 2 instruction (more of core) | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |