

Pasco County Schools

Thomas E. Weightman Middle School



2022-23 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	0
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: 3/20/2017

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	42%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fowler, Rachel	Principal	
Mira, Andressa	Assistant Principal	
Ware, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Abercrombie, Freda	Teacher, K-12	
Beagle, Jessica	Instructional Coach	
Benson, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Britton, Frank	Teacher, K-12	
Eads, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Gioitia, Kristine	Teacher, ESE	
Hernandez, Cyn	Teacher, K-12	
Stallings, Donna	Teacher, K-12	
Valeski, Joy	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Chris	Teacher, K-12	
McHale, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Stocks, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Martin, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	
	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 3/20/2017, Donna Gricoski

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,267

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

20

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	382	401	497	0	0	0	0	1280
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	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
course failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	70	128	0	0	0	0	231
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	42	92	0	0	0	0	170

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	28	25	49	0	0	0	0	102

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	7	0	0	0	0	7
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 7/20/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	46%	50%				65%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						60%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						48%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	55%	34%	36%				69%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%						69%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						62%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	54%	53%				65%	52%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	59%	58%				84%	68%	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	2022					
	2019	64%	56%	8%	54%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	59%	51%	8%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
08	2022					
	2019	67%	58%	9%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	60%	59%	1%	55%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	37%	42%	-5%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2022					
	2019	79%	68%	11%	46%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	48%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	82%	70%	12%	71%	11%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	60%	39%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	62%	38%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	27	19	16	38	38	16	56			
ELL	29	35	26	37	49	40	27	43	80		
ASN	58	46		68	70		67	85	100		
BLK	41	44	35	38	54	51	35	68	70		
HSP	48	41	32	53	60	51	50	73	64		
MUL	58	48	44	61	60	40	55	88	61		
WHT	57	49	28	60	61	61	61	80	77		
FRL	40	40	29	45	57	52	41	64	59		
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		

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	549
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	71
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	48
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	54
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	57
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	59
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Our SWD's sub group did not make learning gains aligned with other subgroups.
The ELA proficiency level and percentage of learning grains decreased.
The learning gains in Mathematics is encouraging.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The ELA proficiency level and percentage of learning grains.
SWD's sub group

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

Concentrated effort in ELA on standards based instruction and providing students with supports when engaged with rigorous learning aligned to grade level standards.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains in Mathematics
Acceleration points

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

increasing T2 supports aligned to course standards
increasing the number of student enrolled in HS courses while enrolled in MS

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

increasing T2 supports aligned to course standards

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.

PLCs will work through detailed process that identified learning targets within standards, common assessments for each learning target, monitoring that data and grouping students accordingly to provide T2 supports and re-assessments

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

PLCs will work through detailed process that identified learning targets within standards, common assessments for each learning target, monitoring that data and grouping students accordingly to provide T2 supports and re-assessments

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The drop in percentages of students meeting proficiency level and those earning learning gains for ELA, Math, Science and Civics drives this focus.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

PLCs at TEWMS will identify, plan, and monitor essential standards for each quarter of the 2022-2023 school year, ensuing that 100% of students demonstrate mastery of standard.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

G1. Monitoring: The School Leadership Team will share and track progress of PLCs with the teaching/learning cycle.
 G1 Monitoring: PLC facilitators will meet quarterly with Administration to report celebrations, progress and supports needed to meet goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachel Fowler (rzick@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

G1.S1: By the end of each quarter, PLCs develop CFAs and T2 resources for at least one essential standard.
 G1.S2: By the end of each quarter PLCs identify students who score less than a 70% on CFAs to receive second change learning opportunities for essential standards and replace original grade with new learning score.
 G1S3: PLCs will design their grade book to have assignments identified with standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Through the districts focus and structures identified for PLC process, we have determined the necessary steps to have PLCs perform that will lead them to plan and monitor student learning against learning targets of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PD for essential standard identification, develop of CFAs

Person Responsible

Heather Ware (hware@pasco.k12.fl.us)

PD for Standards Based grading will be provided during Early Release Days in digestible bites to the whole staff.

Person Responsible

Heather Ware (hware@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Teachers will receive the necessary professional development needed to increase the use of resources that directly align to and match the rigor their grade level standards. This PD will meet them where they are on the continuum of the IPG tool(s).

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Using the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) walkthrough tools to ensure CA 1 is evident in 100% of classrooms while increasing evidence for CA 2. Staff-to-staff delivery of professional development identified by the Instructional Design committee from the IPG walkthrough data. These PD sessions will focus on the

G3 Monitoring: The SLT will conduct quarterly walkthroughs using the IPG for CA 1 in all classrooms.

G3 Monitoring: Presenting of data and data trends to SLT, PLCs and SAC on a quarterly basis against our goal.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Q1: 9/13 at Department MTGs, 9/22 @ SAC, 9/27@Committee

Q2: 10/27@ SAC, 11/1@ Committee, 11/9@SLT

Q3: 1/19@SAC, 1/24@ Committee, 1/31@ SLT

Q4: 4/20@SAC, 4/25@ Department MTGs, 5/9@ Committee

The School Leadership Team will review walkthrough data quarterly and compare walkthrough historical data throughout the school year to determine progress towards goal and the needs of staff to meet goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachel Fowler (rzick@pasco.k12.fl.us)

G3S1: By August 1, 2022, develop walkthrough schedule for Q1, Q2, Q3 & Q4 for the 2022-2023 school year. Q1: 8/29-9/9 Q2: 10/18-1/28 Q3: 1/9-1/20 Q4: 4/3-4/14

G3S2: Baseline data for CA 1 & CA 2 will be collected during Q4 of 2021-2022 school year.

G3 S1: CA1 will be observed through walkthroughs by SLT for semester 1. When data shows more than two consecutive collections of 100% observed, CA2 will be included.

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

G2S1: For each quarter, the Instructional Design committee will review and analyze IPG walkthrough data.

G2S2: For each quarter, the Instructional Design committee will plan and execute school wide differentiated professional development based on the review of walkthrough data.

G2S3: By second quarter, the Instructional Design committee members will develop model classrooms for staff to visit before the end of the 3rd quarter.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the

Teachers need the tools to be able to improve their instruction that will meet the needs of our student with mastering grade level course standards.

**resources/criteria used for
selecting this strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

For each quarter, the Instructional Design committee will plan and execute school wide differentiated professional development based on the review of walkthrough data.

Instructional Design Committee will provide TEWMS PD dates: Q1 @10/7, Q2 @11/11, Q3 @2/3, Q4 @4/14

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

CA1 for all PLCs, use of Qualtrics to collect data for SLT by August 1, 2022.

Person Responsible Rachel Fowler (rzick@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Parent Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Post pandemic has led us to having decreased parent engagement on our campus and with our teachers. This is a concern as we know that connected families and community members increase student success and teacher support.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

TEWMS will increase communication between teachers and parents related to learning objectives and student progress of course standards.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

G4. Monitoring: The SLT will monitor parent communication through myStudent messaging.
 G4. Monitoring: The SLT will monitor parent engagement with classroom awareness with student planners.
 G4. Monitoring: The SLT will develop a parent engagement survey at the end of each quarter to gauge how the community has received the increase communication efforts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

G4S1: Utilize various communications to share upcoming learning targets, assignments, and resources on a bi-weekly basis.
 G4S2: Ensure student grades are accurate in myStudent on a weekly basis.
 G4S3: Every classroom will have learning targets & standards-based assignments posted for students to write in their student planner, on a weekly basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PD for teachers on use of messaging feature in myStudent.

Person Responsible

Heather Ware (hware@pasco.k12.fl.us)

PD for relating student grades to standards and educating families.

Develop video of how to set-up myStudent to get parent notification for August 5, 2022

Person Responsible

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

create a parent engagement committee

Person Responsible

Joy Valeski (jheuser@pasco.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

n/a

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

n/a

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

n/a

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

There are specific systems in place to provide staff with support: grade level content PLCs that have daily common planning time, teachers are arranged on teams whom teach a core group of students, school counselor and grade level administrators travel with students from 6th to 7th to 8th grade, administration is assigned to content departments to attend PLCs and observe classrooms, open communication is intentional from administration to staff on a weekly bases

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

administration: supporting teachers with instructional strategies and student discipline
 school counselors: supporting students with academic and social/emotional needs
 SRPs: supporting families with academic and social/emotional needs of their students
 teachers: open communication with families, building relationships with students
 LDC: supporting teachers with instructional strategies