Tampa Palms Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Tampa Palms Elementary School

6100 TAMPA PALMS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Angela Gluth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (68%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Tampa Palms Elementary School

6100 TAMPA PALMS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[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	No	49%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

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

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 all students with the opportunities to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to realize their potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tampa Palms will be in the top one percent of elementary schools in the nation.

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
Gluth, Angela	Principal	
May, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Small, Elyse	Other	
Smith, Lance	Other	
Sciandra, Cindy	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/3/2022, Angela Gluth

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.*
3

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

Total number of students enrolled at the school
761

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
11

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	116	123	114	131	104	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	701
Attendance below 90 percent	30	37	24	23	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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
Tuesday 7/12/2022

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	110	124	112	120	100	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	17	19	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	18	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	13	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	110	124	112	120	100	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	17	19	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	18	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	13	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	66%	53%	56%				76%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						72%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						48%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	73%	50%	50%				76%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%						71%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						47%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	59%	59%				71%	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	73%	52%	21%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

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	78%	54%	24%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2022					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	68%	51%	17%	53%	15%
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	33	39	42	45	58	73	20				
ELL	59	54	40	75	72		56				
ASN	84	85		91	89		88				
BLK	38	55	64	45	73	83	32				
HSP	55	44	23	68	75	62	58				
MUL	75	71		74	75						
WHT	83	74		84	80		78				
FRL	48	56	58	57	73	73	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	27	25	33	35	31	33	21				
ELL	75	88	80	80	83		90				
ASN	89	82		91	79		92				
BLK	48	43	27	38	52	46	42				
HSP	66	69		63	69		66				
MUL	68			64							
WHT	76	61		79	77		73				
FRL	48	49	36	43	53	38	51				
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	37	57	44	46	58	58	38				
ELL	68	70	39	74	79	63	52				
ASN	93	79		95	92		95				
BLK	52	53	45	46	53	48	43				
HSP	71	76	62	64	62	54	55				
MUL	71	69		71	62						
WHT	77	72	25	82	70	46	76				
FRL	58	66	47	60	61	48	55				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	554
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	74
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	80
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our lowest performance was in the bottom 25% with 54% making gains in ELA (despite being an increase from the previous year). Our ELA proficiency was 66%, which was a decrease from the previous year. There were increases in all three components for math.

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

ELA Achievement, gains, and bottom quartile gains.
5th grade science

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

ELA planning guides showed an imbalance of fiction and nonfiction text with a long focus on certain standards, and increased student absences and tardies contributed to gaps in learning. Learning gaps will be addressed through acceleration and other differentiation practices.

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

Math achievement, gains, and bottom quartile gains all showed improvement from the previous year.

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

The math improvement was attributed to a school-wide professional development focus on math, coaching cycles for math teachers with district resource staff, and the use of data to drive instruction as teachers planned for lessons.

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

Weekly collaborative planning sessions that incorporate the review of student data to drive instructional decisions. Teachers will plan for differentiation and will ensure that learning tasks are aligned with the content standards.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development for ELA teachers is planned to focus on foundational skills and targeted intervention strategies that align with each child's deficiency. Professional development will also focus on planning for small group instruction, utilizing data to plan for small group instruction, and understanding the BEST standards to plan for instruction and facilitate learning using the BEST standards.

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

Grade level content and vertical content PLCs
collaborative planning
student goal setting
ongoing progress monitoring
systematic data review

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 Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students at Tampa Palms have a wide range of learning needs. In order to effectively engage in core instruction, differentiation and acceleration strategies will be a part of all lessons. The effective use of standards-based instruction along with differentiation strategies will close the achievement gap for students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We will see student growth in all grades as measured through the PM assessments. Our goal is for every student to make learning gains.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Teachers will receive monthly feedback focused on how differentiation or acceleration impacted student learning outcomes. Data findings from common assessments will be reviewed when meeting for weekly planning meetings. Plans will include acceleration and/or differentiation strategies as well as common assessments for ongoing progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Gluth (angela.gluth@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Differentiation and acceleration strategies and supports
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Common assessments will be used to assess student needs and identify unfinished learning. Lessons will be differentiated to reinforce and enrich learning, prepare students for upcoming learning, and remediate as needed.

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.

Weekly common planning for reading and math at each grade level

Person Responsible	Jennifer May (jennifer.may@hcps.net)

Common assessments used to progress monitor student learning across the grade level

Person Responsible	Jennifer May (jennifer.may@hcps.net)

Actionable feedback to teachers each month

Person Responsible	Angela Gluth (angela.gluth@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

Students will receive intensive small group instruction that is targeted to specific needs based on data obtained from iReady, common Wonders unit assessments, and the progress monitoring assessments given at the beginning and middle of the school year.

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

Students will receive intensive small group instruction that is targeted to specific needs based on data obtained from iReady, common Wonders unit assessments, and the progress monitoring assessments given at the beginning and middle of the school year.

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)

Increase the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 2, who score at a proficient level, by 3-4 percentage points from the beginning of the year assessment to the end of the year assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring at a proficient level on the statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points.

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.

Student progress will be monitored through the use of common assessments, utilizing iReady, Wonders unit assessments, and PM assessments.

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

May, Jennifer, jennifer.may@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?

Teachers will use a multi-tiered system of support to monitor student progress through core instruction and intensive interventions that target student deficits in English Language Arts. Teachers will align intensive instruction after analyzing student progress monitoring results along with data from core instruction in the classroom.

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?

Utilizing a multi-tiered system of support allows for students to receive targeted instruction that is closely monitored for fidelity with regards to intervention alignment and participation allows teachers to provide intensive support to students in their specific area of need.

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
Assessment: Students will be routinely assessed through iReady diagnostics and progress monitoring assessments, Wonders unit assessments, and progress monitoring assessments. Data from these assessments will be analyzed to develop data-informed lessons that target student literacy deficiencies. The effectiveness of the interventions will be monitored at six week intervals, with adjustments to interventions made as needed.	May, Jennifer, jennifer.may@hcps.net
Professional Learning: Teachers will be provided with professional development as needed to provide support with core instruction when implementing the BEST standards. Teachers will also receive support from the student services team when utilizing the multi-tiered system of support to help eliminate barriers that may impede student learning gains.	Gluth, Angela, angela.gluth@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.

The school will address building a positive school culture and environment through the incorporation of student-led programs/activities that allow students to take an active role in the school. These include but are not limited to focused clubs after school, leadership positions, student council, the National Elementary Junior Honor Society, service learning, and evening events that allow families to form relationships outside of the classroom.
Students will have incentives and rewards through the use of Eagle Bucks to support the tier 1 school-wide behavior system, academic awards, and recognition for character education traits exhibited in the classroom.

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

Administration oversees the implementation of all of the programs at Tampa Palms Elementary. The action team committees develop various leadership opportunities for students, and teachers and staff support the clubs, recognition programs and leadership roles for students. The PTA and SAC work closely with the school to reinforce having a positive school culture.