

Pasco County Schools

Thomas E. Weightman Middle School



2021-22 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 3/16/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	43%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

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.

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

Provide the school's vision 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.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Abercrombie, Freda	Teacher, K-12	
Beagle, Jessica	Instructional Coach	
Benson, Stephanie	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Britton, Frank	Teacher, K-12	
Eads, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Fowler, Rachel	Principal	
Irving, Alana	School Counselor	
Johnson, Laurie	Assistant Principal	
Meyer, Shari	Teacher, K-12	
Mira, Andressa	Assistant Principal	
Riordan, Tricia	Teacher, K-12	
Valeski, Joy	Teacher, K-12	
Ware, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Gioitia, Kristine	Teacher, ESE	
Hernandez, Cyn	Teacher, K-12	
Kidd, BreAnne	Teacher, K-12	
Murphy, Ashlee	Teacher, K-12	
Robinson, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Chris	Teacher, K-12	
	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 3/16/2017, 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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,265

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	388	390	490	0	0	0	0	1268
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	41	57	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	20	55	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	31	84	0	0	0	0	148
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	137	170	233	0	0	0	0	540

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

Sunday 8/1/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	52%	54%	63%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	55%	54%	62%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	47%	47%	52%	41%	47%
Math Achievement				69%	60%	58%	66%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				69%	61%	57%	71%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	52%	51%	67%	53%	51%
Science Achievement				65%	52%	51%	59%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				84%	68%	72%	72%	69%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	64%	56%	8%	54%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	59%	51%	8%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
08	2021					
	2019	67%	58%	9%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	60%	59%	1%	55%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	37%	42%	-5%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2021					
	2019	79%	68%	11%	46%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	48%	14%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	82%	70%	12%	71%	11%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	60%	39%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	62%	38%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	20	31	32	17	30	22	24	30			
ELL	32	47	44	29	34	26	28	40	18		
ASN	75	64		71	38		70	83	50		
BLK	49	42	28	37	31	35	59	60	58		
HSP	49	46	32	42	38	27	43	59	49		
MUL	48	54	40	41	41	54	62	56	50		
WHT	57	51	39	55	46	43	61	68	52		
FRL	39	42	33	35	34	30	41	52	45		
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			

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	64
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	44
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	46
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	50
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	52
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

learning gains in math are low, SWDs have lower learning gains than other groups

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

7th grade math & 7th grade ELA

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

content of course work: use core resources to teach grade level standards

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

social studies achievement went up

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

the focus on standards of the course and providing student with grade level assignments that are aligned to the standards

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

build prior skill within the current grade level teaching

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

content focused PD on core resources

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

use of Tier 2 time and instructional strategies

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Provide all students with opportunities to engage with the work of a lesson; Core Action 3 of IPG.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

G1.S1: By the end of the first quarter, TEWMS will identify and use two instructional routines for students to use that will increase their voice when talk about content.
G1.S2: By the end of the second quarter, TEWMS will identify and use two-three instructional routines for students to use that allow students to collaborate as part of the learning process.

Monitoring:

G1. Monitoring: The School Leadership Team will conduce quarterly classroom walkthroughs focusing on Core action 3 of the IPG tool. The walkthrough data will be shared with the staff at faculty meetings.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Jessica Beagle (jperlman@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:****Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement**

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We are establishing the usage and impact of PBIS on campus. We are utilizing the PBIS online system for students and staff.

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.

We are using the PBIS system for students and staff to increase positive school culture and environment.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers: giving opportunities for students to earn PBIS points that are then redeemed for rewards

Community Members: support rewards for staff; scheduling a few community nights for families to come on campus and enjoy time together.