West Tampa Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

West Tampa Elementary School

2700 W CHERRY ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Kastner

Start Date for this Principal: 6/27/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (61%)
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 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.

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

West Tampa Elementary School
2700 W CHERRY ST, Tampa, FL 33607
[no web address on file]

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

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

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 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.

To provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life.

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
Kastner, Kevin	Principal	Principal
Herdel, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	APEI
Fuentes, Jessica	Parent Engagement Liaison	Parent Involvement

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/27/2019, Kevin Kastner

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.*
2

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
21

Total number of students enrolled at the school
440

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
9

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	19	60	63	67	50	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	11	18	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	1	14	6	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	3	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	59	76	56	56	52	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	349
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	9	13	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	18	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	8	35	24	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	7	5	10	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	59	76	56	56	52	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	349
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	9	13	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	18	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	8	35	24	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	7	5	10	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	46%	53%	56%				52%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						61%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						40%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	63%	50%	50%				60%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%						70%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	59%	59%				57%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	31%	52%	-21%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	55%	-7%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

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	21	29		39	39	40	19				
ELL	41	40	35	63	68	71	35				
BLK	34	38		47	29		14				
HSP	47	48	35	64	72	73	48				
FRL	47	49	43	61	63	52	39				

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	8	21		31	36		8				
ELL	37	30		44	30						
BLK	21	20		44	27						
HSP	42	40		52	37		12				
FRL	37	33		47	33		9				
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	13	38	26	42	59	38	31				
ELL	55	62	30	68	85	70	59				
BLK	36	52	40	43	42	10	40				
HSP	61	64	31	70	83	67	67				
FRL	51	60	38	60	72	40	57				

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	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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	51
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
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	56
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
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?

Students are making academic progress in reading and math. The data indicates stagnation with the science content. However, a large majority remain below level in both reading and math.

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

Phonics, vocabulary, student attendance

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

We need to closely monitor phonics and vocabulary data via IReady. Establish small groups targeting vocabulary and phonics. Purchase phonics instruction materials. Restructure collaborative meetings with support personnel to provide teachers with support in data analysis and implementation of action plans.

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

ELA proficiency went from 38% to 43% on FSA from 2021 to 2022
Math proficiency went from 50% to 64% on FSA from 2021 to 2022

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

All teachers worked closely with the Reading Coach, RtI Resource Teacher, Math Coach, and ESE personnel to monitor formative data and adjust instructional practices to meet the needs of the students,

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

We will provide more time to collaborate and plan with resource teachers and coaches; build common planning time into the school day 7am to 8am,

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.

Aggressive monitoring training and follow up support; monthly PD based on walkthrough trends and teacher needs; trainings on phonics and vocabulary; data analysis protocol trainings, job embedded PD from Coaches and Support Staff; SEL training for all staff and teachers monthly; purchase resources for phonics instructions; utilize technology for teachers to do running records; purchase a math fluency program

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

Implementing a meeting structure that will focus on student data and the continuous improvement model. Utilizing data to student based decisions.

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 Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	During the collaborative planning teachers will focus on scaffolding supports for learners to meet proficiency goals. Despite having collaborative planning last year we did not see the expected outcomes for student achievement.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	As a result of more intentional planning for scaffolded instruction we should see an increases the reading and math performance levels of students in grades K-5 by one grade level from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 3 on Iready.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	During common planning coaches will facilitate sessions with admin to plan for scaffolded supports and formative assessments. Monitor using running records, IReady, FAST and district formative assessments,
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Collaborative planning and PLC's Utilize the BEST standards to plan and impact student proficiency. Utilize Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards 1 and 2 to plan for student success
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	To ensure teachers have time to effectively determine the needs of the students so they can plan for and implement differentiated instruction Ensure teachers plan for meaningful discussions and collaborative practices to push students ability to think critically

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.

Provide mini-professional development (PD) session around the BEST Standards

Discussion and information provided would build on how teachers can collect data effectively during instruction and then utilize it to glean information regarding students' levels of understanding.

Utilize planning to discuss potential student misconceptions prior to instruction.

Work with teachers to create "look-fors" aligned to collaborative classroom discussions which are aligned to BEST standards and benchmarks and ensure that teachers communicate the look-fors to students during their instruction.

Monitor progress all students who did not make progress comparable to their counterparts with the grade levels monitored.

Person Responsible	Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Implement SEL curriculum, create structured time and supports for data analysis and implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and 4 step problem solving protocols.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Students in K-5 will increase scores on DESSA survey from survey 1 to survey 3
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitor using DESSA survey, increased attendance, decrease in behaviors that disrupt learning as evidenced by behavior referrals decreasing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Implementation of PLC's and CBS meetings school-wide
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	In conjunction with district personnel, we chose to partner with Frameworks of Tampa Bay to implement a SEL curriculum school-wide. PLC's are globally known as a best practice.

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.

Schedule collaborative meetings
Schedule PD
Calendar assessments
Calendar data analysis

Person Responsible	Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

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

88% of students in K-2 were identified as below level in phonics and Phonemic Awareness based on the I-Ready diagnostic.

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

In grades 4-5, 50% of students scored below a level 3 on FSA.

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)

We will utilize I-Ready diagnostics for Phonics and Phonemic Awareness to monitor growth for K-2.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

We will utilize I-Ready diagnostics for Phonics and Vocabulary to monitor growth for 3-5 .

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.

During collaborative planning meetings, coaches will work with teachers to assist them with data analysis, identification of resources, planning and modeling effective strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Herdel, Stephanie, stephanie.herdel@hcps.net

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. §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?

Utilize Heggerty Phonemic Awareness curriculum for K-2 and Phonics for Reading for students who are below level in reading in grades 3-5. Purchased decodable readers to supplement instruction where students can take them home to practice. We will also have PLC's, collaborative planning, professional development and coaches will have model classrooms where teachers will observe best practices.

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?

Heggerty is a research based program in phonemic awareness. PLC's, collaborative planning, and professional development helps to build a teacher's efficacy, which has an effect size of 1.57 on Hattie's scale of effective practice.

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
Literacy Leadership *Leadership will collaborate with coaches and attend PLC's *Leadership will also provide data to drive the PLC's Literacy Coaching *Coaches will analyze data to assist teacher with planning *Coaches will model effective strategies Assessment *Classroom walk-through to look for implementation of the plans *Monitor the use and growth in I-Ready Professional Learning *Professional development monthly *Professional development to meet the needs of the teachers and students based on data.	Kastner, Kevin, kevin.kastner@hcps.net

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.

Partnerships with PTA
Partnership with Frameworks of Tampa Bay to implement SEL curriculum
Frequent student and staff incentives

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

Kevin Kastner
Stephanie Herdel
Jessica Fuentes
Sunshine Members - TBD
Frameworks of Tampa Bay
West Tampa PTS