Hillsborough County Public Schools

Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School

8715 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33604

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lipi Datta Reid

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (48%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 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

Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School

8715 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33604

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	97%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	C

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 cultivate a scholarly community where all students achieve intellectual and personal excellence through leadership development, innovative learning, individual responsibility, and impactful service.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering every student, every day, 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
Wilson, Ovett	Principal	Leadership team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principals Academic Coachers Team Leaders Subject Area Leaders Guidance Counselors Psychologist Social Worker ESE Specialist Success Coach The Leadership team meets regularly every month bi-weekly. The purpose of the Leadership team is to: 1. Support the goals of the SIP Plan 2. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the MTSS/RTI process 3. Review ongoing process and progress monitoring data at the core and to ensure fidelity of instructional practices at Tier I and enrichment for Tiers 2 and 3. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/30/2020, Lipi Datta Reid

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.*
3

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

78

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (48%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	75	92	103	103	136	100	112	121	91	0	0	0	0	933
Attendance below 90 percent	21	37	38	33	43	37	30	62	41	0	0	0	0	342
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	45	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	16	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	32	28	41	34	39	0	0	0	0	174
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	27	44	55	46	48	0	0	0	0	220

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	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	6	36	40	4	10	8	9	0	0	0	0	116
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	102	122	136	146	125	123	131	87	92	0	0	0	0	1064
Attendance below 90 percent	34	34	35	30	37	18	33	27	24	0	0	0	0	272
One or more suspensions	3	8	12	17	27	5	36	10	15	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	11	48	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	91	60	69	65	40	45	0	0	0	0	370

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	1	2	9	31	38	18	44	22	43	0	0	0	0	208

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	2	13	24	60	40	46	65	66	53	0	0	0	0	369
Students retained two or more times	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	
Number of students enrolled	102	122	136	146	125	123	131	87	92	0	0	0	0	1064
Attendance below 90 percent	34	34	35	30	37	18	33	27	24	0	0	0	0	272
One or more suspensions	3	8	12	17	27	5	36	10	15	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	11	48	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	91	60	69	65	40	45	0	0	0	0	370

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	1	2	9	31	38	18	44	22	43	0	0	0	0	208

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	2	13	24	60	40	46	65	66	53	0	0	0	0	369
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	6	1	2	9	14	6	0	0	0	0	39

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	29%	57%	61%	22%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	59%	46%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	54%	52%	53%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	34%	55%	62%	23%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	51%	57%	59%	53%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	52%	65%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	24%	50%	56%	20%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	52%	77%	78%	35%	78%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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
03	2019	23%	52%	-29%	58%	-35%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	26%	55%	-29%	58%	-32%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		26%				
05	2019	25%	54%	-29%	56%	-31%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		25%				
06	2019	26%	53%	-27%	54%	-28%
	2018	24%	52%	-28%	52%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				
07	2019	23%	54%	-31%	52%	-29%
	2018	14%	52%	-38%	51%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	20%	53%	-33%	56%	-36%
	2018	22%	54%	-32%	58%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	26%	54%	-28%	62%	-36%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	25%	57%	-32%	64%	-39%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		25%				
05	2019	32%	54%	-22%	60%	-28%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		32%				
06	2019	20%	49%	-29%	55%	-35%
	2018	19%	48%	-29%	52%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
07	2019	36%	62%	-26%	54%	-18%
	2018	24%	61%	-37%	54%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
08	2019	30%	31%	-1%	46%	-16%
	2018	12%	29%	-17%	45%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	20%	51%	-31%	53%	-33%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	21%	47%	-26%	48%	-27%
	2018	15%	48%	-33%	50%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	67%	-27%	71%	-31%
2018	35%	65%	-30%	71%	-36%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		5%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	63%	37%	61%	39%
2018	86%	63%	23%	62%	24%
Compare		14%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%

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	44	45	30	40	28	13	56			
ELL	21	45	35	28	56	58	15	40			
BLK	25	48	48	32	49	39	22	53			
HSP	33	51	43	38	55	53	32	47			
MUL	38	58		25	50						
WHT	37	55		45	55		7				
FRL	29	49	48	34	50	47	21	51	100		

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	16	42	45	15	41	45	7	26			
ELL	12	47	53	5	45	54	15	21			
BLK	21	39	50	21	42	36	13	39	87		
HSP	23	45	63	25	49	55	19	35			
WHT	25	62		31	31						
FRL	22	43	58	24	45	42	16	37	74		

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	1	37	49	1	45	60		6			
ELL	9	39	45	9	50	64		15			
BLK	17	39	49	19	49	59	14	35	76		
HSP	30	54	57	25	49	67	26	28	79		
MUL	40			27	70						
WHT	36	71		43	93						
FRL	22	46	52	23	53	66	20	35	78		

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	40
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	44
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	43
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	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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

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.

The lowest performance trend is in science. Our Achievement level was at 24%. We have not had a solid science teacher for the last 3 years. Last year we lost our science teacher in the middle of the school year. This upcoming school year we have hired a science coach to help us in this area.

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

The greatest decline came with our ELA lowest 25%. We dropped from 56% to 48%. We could have done a better job with our targeted approach. We have developed a 3 part sorting and support plan to help us with that during the upcoming school year.

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.

Our ELA achievement data had the greatest gap in comparison to the state. Our gap was 32% in this area. The state was 61% and Woodson was 29%. Standard aligned planning, instruction and assessment is the contributing factor that has impacted our gap in ELA.

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

The most improved area was in Civics. We improved 15% in this area. We focused on small group instruction and our instructional delivery in this class. Our frequent assessments helped us to focus on targeted instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

For the early warning system we would like to reduce or failure rate in ELA and Math. Also we would like to reduce our level ones students by a minimum of 15%.

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

1. Science Achievement Data
2. ELA Achievement Data
3. Math Achievement Data
4. Reduce failure rate by 25%
5. Reduce level 1 by 15%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA achievement data had the greatest gap in comparison to the state. Our gap was 32% in this area. The state was 61% and Woodson was 29%. Standard aligned planning, instruction and assessment is the contributing factor that has impacted our gap in ELA. Students need to be provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning.
Measurable Outcome:	By October 2020, at least 80% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks according to learning walk data (both virtual and in-person). By December 2020, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks. Common assessment data in ELA will show 35% of students performing at or above proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lipi Datta-Reid (lipi.datta-reid@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Professional learning communities will be focused on standards-based planning, student work analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard DuFour's PLC questions: 1. What is it we want our students to learn? 2. How will we know if each student has learned it? 3. How will we respond when some students do not learn it? 4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the Opportunity Myth. Students need grade level text that aligns with the standards. In order to provide students opportunities to engage in grade appropriate standards-based tasks, teachers will be supported through a structure for professional learning communities focused on effective teaching methods for learning. Additionally, according to John Hattie's Effect Size on Professional Development is 0.62 which has a big impact on student learning. Learning by Doing: A Handbook for PLCs at Work (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, and Many) https://www.solutiontree.com/products/learning-by-doing-third-edition.html

Action Steps to Implement

Establish a Culture, Expectation and Structure for Effective PLC's
Allow master schedule to have common planning for grade levels.
Establish structure and expectations for content PLC's
Use PLC protocol from DuFour's framework. Supports will be geared around standard-based planning, teaching and assessing.
Admin communicate PLC's expectations
Use pre-planning to have content team develop protocol and expectations
Roles will be defined by the end of pre-planning for PLC's (Teacher, Coaches & Admin)

Person Responsible	Ovett Wilson (ovett.wilson@hcps.net)

Developing Teacher Capacity
The leadership team will develop look fors centered around standard-aligned instruction.
The leadership team will conduct walk-throughs to collect data on the implementation of instruction planned during PLC and student learning outcomes.
Group and individual data will be communicated to teachers so that celebrations and improvements could be made.
Leadership Team will use data to tier and support teacher needs.
Coaching cycles will be developed to support teacher need.

Person Responsible   Lipi Datta-Reid (lipi.datta-reid@hcps.net)

Analyzing Student Data
Student work and data will be used to establish next steps for teachers.
PLC's will be used to establish common standards-aligned tasks that will be given to monitor students mastery.
Student work will be used at PLC's
Trends will be identified and coaches will guide teachers in identifying trends and supports needed to improve student learning.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Our instructional priority at Woodson this year is to: 1. Align task to grade-level standard. 2.Instructional Priority: Reading and writing across all content.

Based on the research from the Opportunity Myth we are pushing for our students to have access to grade-level standards and tasks that are rigorous for them. Teachers have access to coaches in the area that we underperformed. We have secured a science, math, and 2 reading coaches to help support teachers in: PLC's, Data review, planning, and task alignment.

Additionally, we are pushing the priority of reading and writing across all content. This we believe will help to push the cognitive demands of our students.

We will tier our teachers based on the need for support and we will focus our coaching cycles around the needs. We will conduct full ILW per 9 weeks and mini ones in between. This is for us to secure the data needed to help improve our practice.

We are particularly doing this to help improve our ESSA subgroups: Blacks, White, ELL and SWD. We believe if we enhance the quality of instruction, and deep engagement our ESSA subgroups will do much better.

Our ESSA subgroups will be targeted and pulled for small group instructions during the school day. Our coaches will provide targeted small group support during the day for students who will need it base on our assessment data. We will also use our after school tutoring program to help our focus with our ESSA groups. Our 21Century Grant allows us to give additional support to our ESSA subgroups through after school enrichment. ESSA students will also have targeted support before school starts from 7:10-7:40am. They will be pulled for morning work on iReady and Achieve 3000.

Morning meetings are with administration and grade-level teams to discuss what is approaching regarding assessments, procedures, or any other items that relate to the grade level team. It is to ensure we are communicating with each team weekly with the same message. It is also a time to come together and discuss any concerns that need to be addressed.

Professional Learning Communities are with administrators, coaches, and teachers. We focus on a framework for planning, assessments, looking at student data, and diving into grade-level standards.

Instructional Learning Team meetings is with the leadership team where we create look-fors based on our instructional priority, look into school data, create targeted walkthroughs with the team, and look at the results of the walkthroughs.

The cultural meeting will meet to create action steps based on our cultural priority and the areas in the TELL survey. One member from each area will compose the steering committee which will give voice to all stakeholders.

Committee Meetings: Teachers will select a committee that they want to serve on and work on projects to improve Woodson.

New Teacher PLC –Training and support for new to Woodson and new to teaching.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

This year our cultural goal will be "to build an atmosphere of mutual respect and rapport." We have developed a PBIS Team that will focus on promoting the positive behaviors of student and staff on campus. We have also formed a discipline team that will focus on restorative measures for students.

The faculty will study the 13 high trust behaviors by Stephen Covey

This year we will focus on building relationships with students and teachers. Data from the 2019-2020 student Tell Survey revealed that 93% of the students at Woodson agreed that teachers cared about them (an increase from 89% the previous year). Breakfast in the classroom ensured that relationships were developed between teachers and students before the instructional day. A school-wide positive support system will be established to create a safe, caring, and nurturing environment. We will focus on starting our school day with positive conversations, morning work and other strategies related to building classroom culture.

We will have our weekly team meetings for grade levels and will celebrate the success of students in front of their peers.

We will continue or student of the month where we celebrate students for their hard work. We will also celebrate leader of the month where we will acknowledge students who have demonstrated leadership qualities for the month.

We will continue of Tutor-A-Bull program with the partnership of USF.

We will continue or parthneship with McDonald, Publix, Feeding Tampa Bay, Local churches, and parent volunteers.

We will have morning greeters at the doors daily to welcome student to school.

We will create a welcoming atmosphere during lunch and free time so students enjoy the atmosphere of the campus and school.

The culture committee will review the progress of culture on campus monthly and make recommendations for improvement monthly.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$297,801.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		160-Other Support Personnel	0682 - Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$25,000.00
			Notes: Works with our access students to provide additional support for students and teachers.			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0682 - Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$50,000.00
			Notes: Upper Campus Reading Coach will support grades 5-8: Examine best practices, develop teachers, provide coaching, help with lesson plans, facilitate PLC's, develop coaching cycles, help with resources for teachers, and other needs that may not be here listed.			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0682 - Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$50,000.00
			Notes: Science coach to support science across the campus. Science Coach will support the development of science in all grade levels: Examine best practices, develop teachers, provide coaching, help with lesson plans, facilitate PLC's, develop coaching cycles, help with resources for teachers, and other needs that may not be here listed.			
		643-Capitalized Hardware and Technology-Related Infrastructure	0682 - Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School	Title, I Part A		$63,801.00
			Notes: Purchase laptops for students to use in class for small group rotations. This will assist elearning also if we have to go that route.			
		643-Capitalized Hardware and Technology-Related Infrastructure	0682 - Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School	Title, I Part A		$20,000.00
			Notes: Purchase 4 presentation Qomo computer/Screens and accessories. Used for teacher, parent and student trainings and presentations.			
		590-Other Materials and Supplies	0682 - Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School	Title, I Part A		$25,000.00
			Notes: Teaching supplies for teaching and learning.			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0682 - Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$50,000.00
			Notes: Student Success Coach: Coaches students on academics strategies, and behaviors. EWS students are assigned to him for progress monitoring and coaching. He will help to develop the PBIS program and assit with our parent involvement program.			
		140-Substitute Teachers	0682 - Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School	Title, I Part A		$4,000.00
			Notes: Subs will be used as needed during the school year. We will use to create planning time for departments to have team planning during the school year.			
		390-Other Purchased Services	0682 - Dr Carter G Woodson K 8 School	Title, I Part A		$10,000.00
			Notes: RICCO budget for print cost for the year.			
					Total:	$297,801.00