

Pasco County Schools

# Thomas E. Weightman Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# 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: 9/9/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

## 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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
Valeski, Joy	Teacher, K-12	Reading Teacher: Intensive reading

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 9/9/2020, Donna Gricoski



**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.*

5

**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.*

19

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

57

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A

<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	62	62	0	0	0	0	197
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	62	62	0	0	0	0	197
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	80	80	0	0	0	0	229
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

### 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	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	

**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	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	

## 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	
	(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	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%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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		
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		

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
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	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	68
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	57
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.**

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?**

- 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus Description and 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.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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 Steps to Implement**

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**

[no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and 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.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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 Steps to Implement**

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)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The school leadership team meets monthly to monitor progress of yearly focus and goals. In addition, this group develops, designs and trains the staff on these focuses.**

**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.

The School Advisory Council meeting quarterly to review the progress made, direction going and assists with setting goals for the school. The PTSA is a way that we build community connections. In addition, we are working to increase our business partnerships with local companies and organizations.

#### **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**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>