

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Wilson Middle School



2021-22 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>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Wilson Middle School

1005 W SWANN AVE, Tampa, FL 33606

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Keith Fantauzzo**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

<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>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (79%) 2015-16: A (76%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<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>	[not available]

\* 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 Hillsborough 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Bulldogs will persevere to become compassionate citizens and successful life-long learners!

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Woodrow Wilson Middle School students will be prepared for 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
Fantauzzo, Keith	Principal	
Batista, Amanda	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/29/2021, Keith Fantauzzo

**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.*

1

**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.*

14

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

32

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

620

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

5

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

4

**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	218	192	210	0	0	0	0	620
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	17	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	10	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	10	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	21	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	1	3	0	0	0	0	4

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/27/2021

**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	212	201	183	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	21	28	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	10	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	10	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	21	0	0	0	0	48

**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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

**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	11	3	5	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	13

**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	212	201	183	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	21	28	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	10	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	10	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	21	0	0	0	0	48

**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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

**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	11	3	5	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	13

**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	73%			79%	51%	54%	80%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	63%			63%	52%	54%	65%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%			54%	47%	47%	53%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	73%			84%	55%	58%	88%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	63%			71%	57%	57%	72%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%			65%	52%	51%	62%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	66%			74%	47%	51%	79%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	85%			93%	67%	72%	86%	66%	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	76%	53%	23%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	83%	54%	29%	52%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
08	2021					
	2019	76%	53%	23%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	70%	49%	21%	55%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	93%	62%	31%	54%	39%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
08	2021					
	2019	38%	31%	7%	46%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	74%	47%	27%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison						



<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					
<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	94%	67%	27%	71%	23%
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	97%	63%	34%	61%	36%
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Achieve 3000 - ELA All Levels  
 Power BI Report Server - Math Baselines All Levels  
 Power BI Report Server - Civics Baselines 7th Grade  
 Power BI Report Server - Science Baselines 8th Grade

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	40	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	20	25
	Students With Disabilities	47	53	59
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72.4	72.85	
	Economically Disadvantaged	52.75	64	
	Students With Disabilities	80.1	82.4	
	English Language Learners	49.6	52.9	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	42	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	22	22
	Students With Disabilities	58	62	65
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72.2	55.3	
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.3	35.5	
	Students With Disabilities	84.7	67.9	
	English Language Learners	25.1	25.06	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	69.3	76.3	
	Economically Disadvantaged	55.8	53.8	
	Students With Disabilities	84.1	87.5	
	English Language Learners	40.7	47.4	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40	48	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	36	47
	Students With Disabilities	45	52	56
	English Language Learners	0	0	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	66.9	50.4	
	Economically Disadvantaged	60.8	46.2	
	Students With Disabilities	72.3	56.4	
	English Language Learners	74.7	65.2	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	63.6	58.4	
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.7	46.8	
	Students With Disabilities	63.6	59.3	
	English Language Learners	31	54.7	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

**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	25	41	34	29	46	47	21	33	50		
ELL	46	58	55	39	47	32		71			
ASN	88	79		82	57						
BLK	39	43	42	31	32	20		60			
HSP	66	58	51	61	58	38	53	70	85		
MUL	78	75		68	64						
WHT	77	66	35	82	67	52	71	91	88		
FRL	54	57	48	51	52	34	47	65	76		
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	32	44	41	37	43	39	25	69	60		
ELL	35	52	45	52	50	48	8	77			

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
ASN	85	53		95	75				100		
BLK	42	47	55	61	72	63	31	70	91		
HSP	72	66	56	75	64	63	63	88	87		
MUL	93	79		96	88			100			
WHT	82	63	54	88	73	65	82	96	88		
FRL	59	58	52	67	58	56	45	79	87		
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	33	39	31	50	48	47	40	45	75		
ELL	37	53	59	57	53	50		38			
ASN	95	76		95	76		100		100		
BLK	38	53	52	64	62	52	56	71	91		
HSP	68	65	57	77	66	55	62	73	92		
MUL	83	69		75	68						
WHT	86	66	51	93	75	74	84	91	94		
FRL	59	55	53	68	58	51	55	71	86		

**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)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	660
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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
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
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	70
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## 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?

We had a decrease in Achievement across all content areas.  
We saw a significant drop in Achievement Levels in Math specifically 7th & 8th Grade Baselines.  
Our overall School Math Achievement decreased from 2019 (84) to 2021 (73)

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in 7th and 8th grade Math

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

Decrease in achievement scores.  
Actions taken will be to train faculty & staff in acceleration vs remediation through ILT/Lead Team meetings, Grade level Meetings and Faculty Meetings. .  
We believe that aligned with the COVID Pandemic and students in and out of the classroom due to quarantines and ELearning offerings, students missed out on significant learning.  
Teachers will use differentiated instruction strategies to incorporate concepts students have difficulty with into their everyday teaching. This strategy will be ongoing

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

We did see improvement in the Achieve 3000 data across all grade levels.

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

Grade Level teaming and planning.  
Consistent use of Achieve3000 practice assessments

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

Teachers will pull data from baselines, and classroom assessments to determine which concepts students are struggling with and will continue to incorporate strategies within their instruction to enrich the learning of these concepts.

#### 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.

Teachers will be trained on Acceleration vs Remediation. Through ILT/Lead Teacher meetings, Professional Development needs will be determined and coordinated. Teachers may need training on analyzing their data and how to retrieve meaningful data.

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

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Our overall achievement levels from 2019 decreased across all content areas in 2021.
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	We believe that aligned with the COVID Pandemic and students in and out of the classroom due to quarantines and ELearning offerings, students missed out on significant learning and is evident in our data.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	Increase in overall student Achievement will increase by at least 2 points in each area.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Teachers will use Baseline data to determine where their students are at in the content and will use this data to differentiate instruction within their content. Teachers will be trained in Acceleration vs Remediation.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Amanda Batista (amanda.batista@hcps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Professional development will be offered throughout the school year addressing differentiation in the classroom. We will offer "Model Classrooms," Professional Development by District personnel as needed for teachers and/Administration on and off-site.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Aligns with the District Instructional Priorities and allows room for "filling in the gaps" for our students, instead of holding them back as we move forward from the COVID Pandemic.

#### Action Steps to Implement

Through District PD and ILT/Lead Team Meetings, faculty meetings, Administration will ensure all staff members understand how to implement the Acceleration vs. Remediation strategy. PD will be determined by need based on data provided and discussed in ILT/Lead Team meetings.

**Person Responsible** Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.floridacims.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.

### 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.**

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

### Part V: Budget

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