

Pasco County Schools

West Zephyrhills Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

West Zephyrhills Elementary School

37900 14TH AVE, Zephyrhills, FL 33542

<https://wzes.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Christina Twardosz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 83% |
| 2018-19 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* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (37%) 2014-15: C (48%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | YEAR 1 |
| Support Tier | IMPLEMENTING |

| ESSA Status | TS&I |
|--|------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

West Zephyrhills Elementary School

37900 14TH AVE, Zephyrhills, FL 33542

<https://wzes.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>86%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>45%</p> |

School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | C | D | D |

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.

Learn together, grow together, lead together.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating inspiring leaders for today and tomorrow.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Atkins, Scott | Principal | |
| Burke, Robin | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Madagan, Georgianna | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Gilbert, Peggy | Assistant Principal | |
| Buckler, Emily | Teacher, K-12 | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 145 | 122 | 133 | 183 | 122 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 838 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 25 | 27 | 40 | 23 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 19 | 22 | 39 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 50 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 |

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 | 3 | 24 | 26 | 44 | 34 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |

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 |

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/13/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 35% | 58% | 57% | 39% | 56% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 41% | 56% | 58% | 42% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 54% | 53% | 46% | 52% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 36% | 60% | 63% | 42% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 55% | 61% | 62% | 43% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 50% | 51% | 28% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 41% | 53% | 53% | 36% | 49% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 145 (0) | 122 (0) | 133 (0) | 183 (0) | 122 (0) | 133 (0) | 838 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 (0) | 25 (0) | 27 (0) | 40 (0) | 23 (0) | 28 (0) | 163 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 1 (0) | 3 (0) | 5 (0) | 16 (0) | 12 (0) | 6 (0) | 43 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 (0) | 19 (0) | 22 (0) | 39 (0) | 23 (0) | 4 (0) | 109 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 66 (18) | 50 (0) | 55 (0) | 171 (18) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 34% | 60% | -26% | 58% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 57% | -17% | 57% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 37% | 59% | -22% | 58% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 55% | -5% | 56% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 32% | 55% | -23% | 56% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 56% | -20% | 55% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -18% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 21% | 59% | -38% | 62% | -41% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 59% | -17% | 62% | -20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -21% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 48% | 62% | -14% | 64% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 59% | -13% | 62% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 35% | 57% | -22% | 60% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 31% | 58% | -27% | 61% | -30% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 39% | 53% | -14% | 53% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 56% | -18% | 55% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 20 | 33 | 43 | 20 | 41 | 52 | 24 | | | | |
| ELL | 17 | 43 | 67 | 38 | 75 | 75 | 31 | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 31 | 10 | 18 | 33 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 41 | 53 | 41 | 65 | 61 | 37 | | | | |
| MUL | 48 | 43 | | 36 | 43 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 36 | 42 | 45 | 36 | 54 | 39 | 43 | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 39 | 42 | 32 | 53 | 46 | 40 | | | | |

| 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 | 34 | 55 | 50 | 25 | 36 | 26 | 11 | | | | |
| ELL | 13 | 53 | 45 | 33 | 55 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 43 | 57 | 20 | 23 | 29 | 32 | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 53 | 53 | 40 | 50 | 36 | 32 | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | 75 | | 32 | 36 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 43 | 50 | 47 | 44 | 32 | 45 | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 48 | 52 | 39 | 42 | 31 | 35 | | | | |

| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 17 | 35 | 35 | 18 | 29 | 26 | | | | | |
| ELL | 7 | 26 | | 27 | 35 | | 8 | | | | |
| ASN | 50 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 42 | 42 | 15 | 44 | 36 | | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 40 | 33 | 37 | 37 | 35 | 33 | | | | |
| MUL | 38 | 14 | | 44 | 36 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 44 | 53 | 47 | 44 | 26 | 42 | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 38 | 46 | 37 | 42 | 26 | 30 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 46 |
| 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 | 67 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 364 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| 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 | 52 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 19 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 50 |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 45 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

3rd grade math had the lowest performance with 21% proficient (District: 59%, State: 62%). Our 3rd grade team was made up of eight teachers and four of the teachers were brand new. We also started the school year with an open 3rd grade teaching position. Administration began tracking math data during the first quarter and second quarter and noticed that the data was low. As a result, we decided to "specialize" after winter break. We also assigned our math coach to the third grade team and she provided Eureka Math professional development and helped them plan for instruction.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

3rd grade math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. We had 21% proficient in math in 2019 and 42% proficient in math in 2018. There was a 21% decline from the prior year. The decline was evident for the same reasons stated above.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

3rd grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We had 21% proficient and the state had 62% proficient. There was a difference of 41%. This gap was evident for the same reasons stated above.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our 4th grade math cohort comparison made a 6% gain this year. We focused on analyzing grade level results on common formative assessments and then adjusting our instruction based on the results. For example, we retaught the math standard to the students who struggled with the first common formative assessment. Then we re-assessed these students to see if they gained a better understanding of the math concept.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

1. The number of students who have an attendance rate of less than 90%.
2. Th number of students who achieved a level 1.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Tier III Targeted Supports
2. Use of "Common Formative Assessments" to drive our instructional practices
3. PBIS Level I School
4. Cooperative Learning Strategies professional development
5. Social-Emotional Learning school wide professional development

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|---|--|
| #1 | |
| Title | High Impact Instruction |
| Rationale | Our grade level teams will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities and use common formative assessments to monitor student progress and adjust their instructional practices based on student data. Teachers will also plan and implement tier III targeted interventions for struggling students to close learning gaps. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By the end of June 2020, 50% of our third, fourth, and fifth grade students will be proficient in reading and math based on the results of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) tests. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Scott Atkins (satkins@pasco.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Grade level teams are going to meet weekly to discuss student data and provide tiered supports. Based on our school's data, we have approximately, 95 students who are in need of tier III reading interventions. We used our school's Independent Reading Level Assessment (IRLA) data and Easy CBM reading assessments focusing on fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension to determine each student's needs. Students will be grouped based on their targeted need and receive 20 minutes of tier III targeted instruction four days per week with a certified teacher. In addition, the classroom teacher is going to assess the student weekly and graph their data. Administration and our school-based coaches are going to meet with each grade level every six weeks to progress monitor. Tier II supports will be given to students who do not show mastery of the reading standard taught during the their assigned reading block. The teacher will also reassess the student once they receive additional support. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify students needing tier III supports based on IRLA data and baseline Easy CBM reading assessments 2. Group students based on targeted need 3. Classroom teachers are going to meet with these students four days a week for 20 minutes providing tier III support 4. Administration, school-based, and district-based coaches are going to progress monitor our lowest 35% 5. Classroom teachers are going to use "common formative assessments" to monitor student progress on the Florida Standards 6. Classroom teachers are going to provide tier II support for the student who do not do well on their "common formative assessment". They are also going to provide enrichment for the students who demonstrate proficiency on the standard taught |
| Person Responsible | Scott Atkins (satkins@pasco.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #2 | |
| Title | Collaborative Culture |
| Rationale | Staff will adhere to a collective commitment centered around student achievement and well being. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By June 2020, we will process 20% less discipline referrals compared the the number of referrals processed during the 2018-2019 school year. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Scott Atkins (satkins@pasco.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Our staff will receive professional development and begin Class Meetings in their classrooms. Our staff will also receive professional development once per month on Social-Emotional Learning. Lastly, our instructional staff is going to receive two full days of Kagan Cooperative Learning training and two full days of Kagan Cooperative Learning coaching. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our school is implementing Class Meetings, which will enable our staff to begin each day as a community of caring and respectful learners. Classroom Meetings will provide opportunities for our students to practice the skills of greeting, listening and responding, group problem-solving, and noticing and anticipating. Morning Meetings will give our teachers concrete ways to make academics engaging, manage classrooms effectively, and create a positive classroom climate. In addition, our staff is going to learn more about Social-Emotional Learning and how to implement these strategies in their classrooms to increase student engagement. Lastly, our staff is going to receive two days of professional development and coaching around Kagan Cooperative Learning. This training and coaching is designed to improve student engagement and increase student achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff will receive professional development and implement Class Meetings 2. Staff will also receive professional development around Social-Emotional Learning 3. Staff will receive two days of professional development and two days of coaching in Kagan Cooperative Learning |
| Person Responsible | Scott Atkins (satkins@pasco.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|---|--|
| #3 | |
| Title | Data Driven Decisions |
| Rationale | Administration, coaches, and teachers will analyze data from our Early Warning System, IRLA, Quarterly Assessments, and Common Formative Assessments to identify, support, and monitor student achievement and behavior. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By the end of June 2020, 50% or more of our lowest 25% third, fourth, and fifth grade students will make a learning gain on their reading and math Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) tests. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Scott Atkins (satkins@pasco.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Grade level teams will create, provide, and monitor tier III interventions for universal skills in ELA and math. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Based on our school's data, we have approximately, 95 students who are in need of tier III reading interventions. We used our school's Independent Reading Level Assessment (IRLA) data and Easy CBM reading assessments focusing on fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension to determine each student's needs. Students will be grouped based on their targeted need and receive 20 minutes of tier III targeted instruction four days per week with a certified teacher. In addition, the classroom teacher is going to assess the student weekly and graph their data. Administration and our school-based coaches are going to meet with each grade level every six weeks to progress monitor. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify students needing tier III supports based on IRLA data and baseline Easy CBM reading assessments 2. Group students based on targeted need 3. Classroom teachers are going to meet with these students four days a week for 20 minutes providing tier III support 4. Administration, school-based, and district-based coaches are going to progress monitor our lowest 35% 5. Classroom teachers are going to use "common formative assessments" to monitor student progress on the Florida Standards 6. Classroom teachers are going to provide tier II support for the student who do not do well on their "common formative assessment". They are also going to provide enrichment for the students who demonstrate proficiency on the standard taught 7. Teachers and staff will implement Kagan Cooperative Learning strategies to improve student engagement 5. |
| Person Responsible | Scott Atkins (satkins@pasco.k12.fl.us) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

NA