

Pasco County Schools

# West Zephyrhills Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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: 7/13/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: F (31%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	YEAR 1
<b>Support Tier</b>	IMPLEMENTING
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## West Zephyrhills Elementary School

37900 14TH AVE, Zephyrhills, FL 33542

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.**

Empowering students to believe, achieve, and persevere.

### 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
Atkins, Scott	Principal	
Correa, Lyna	Administrative Support	
Gregory, Andrea	Instructional Coach	
Burke, Robin	Teacher, K-12	
Fox, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	
Bee, Kelsie	Teacher, K-12	
Buckler, Emily	Teacher, K-12	
Hewlett, Camillia	Teacher, K-12	
Elie, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Valdez, Deana	Instructional Coach	
Windows, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Averill, Crystal	Teacher, ESE	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/13/2022, Christina Twardosz

**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.*

**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.*

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

31

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

591

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

5

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.****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	110	94	97	119	105	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	8	14	10	13	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failures in both ELA/math	0	0	0	10	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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**

Wednesday 7/13/2022



**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	92	109	88	113	121	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	650
Attendance below 90 percent	35	47	33	35	42	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	245
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	18	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 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	
Course failures ELA or Math	22	24	7	14	52	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	11	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

**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	24	37	18	24	39	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188

**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	3	0	0	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	92	109	88	113	121	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	650
Attendance below 90 percent	35	47	33	35	42	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	245
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	18	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 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	
Course failures ELA or Math	22	24	7	14	52	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	11	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

#### 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	24	37	18	24	39	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188

#### 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	3	0	0	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

## 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	29%	52%	56%				35%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						41%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%						42%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	26%	46%	50%				36%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	32%						55%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	22%						47%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	50%	59%				41%	53%	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	34%	60%	-26%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	59%	-22%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2022					
	2019	32%	55%	-23%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

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	21%	59%	-38%	62%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2022					
	2019	35%	57%	-22%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	53%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	14	17	14	14	20	15	14				
ELL	22	24	10	16	35		18				
BLK	22	41	27	8	22		11				
HSP	26	45	37	25	37	21	35				
MUL	44			31							
WHT	30	36	24	29	32	20	50				
FRL	25	38	31	22	32	20	34				
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	13	17	40	7	15		5				
ELL	21	43		11	19		13				
BLK	31			23							
HSP	31	54		23	35		27				
MUL	64			36							
WHT	34	41	35	28	43	56	39				
FRL	33	39	43	24	39	55	30				
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				

### 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	31

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	251
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	23
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	32
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	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

### 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?

##### SWDs:

Strengths- 2022 maintained 40% in ELA Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% slight difference from 2019 43% in ELA Learning Gains in the Lowest 25%

Gaps- Achievement Levels in both ELA and Math decreased: Math 2019 (20% proficient) to Math 2022 (7% proficient): ELA 2019 (20% proficient) to ELA 2022 (13% proficient).

No Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% in Math.

##### Black:

Strengths- Both ELA and Math Achievement levels increased: Math 2019 (18% proficient) to Math 2022 (23% proficient): ELA 2019 (24% proficient) to ELA 2022 (31% proficient)

Gaps- No Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% in both Math and ELA

##### Hispanic:

Strengths- ELA Learning Gains increased: ELA 2019 (41% proficient) and ELA 2022 (54% proficient)

Gaps- Math Achievement level decreased: Math 2019 (41% proficient) and Math 2022 (23% proficient).

No Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% in both Math and ELA

From 2022 statewide assessment- Fifth grade math had the lowest performance with 24% proficient. Third grade ELA had the lowest performance with 24% proficient.

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

Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% in Math was the greatest need for improvement.

SLW: 2019 (52% proficient)/ 2022 (0% proficient)

Hispanic: 2019 (61% proficient)/ 2022 (0% proficient)

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

Student performance on district and state assessments contributed to the need for improvement in the area of math in the intermediate grades.

Actions taken to address the need for improvement include:

- extended PLC's bi-weekly
- additional half-day planning sessions with coaches
- addition of math coach, MTSS coach and intervention teacher

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

Our 4th grade ELA data increased from 2020 (30% proficient) and 2021 (36% proficient)

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

We focused on analyzing grade level results on common formative assessments in adjusting our instruction based on the results. The team had Tier 3 time for ELA where they used HMH module assessments to identify the standard.

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

We are going to triangulate data to identify learning gaps to provide tier 2 and tier 3 supports in an effort to close the learning gaps. Our school will be providing advanced math in order to provide extended learning opportunities for our 4th and 5th graders. We will also be implementing the Insync platform from Eureka Math to identify gaps in learning and assist in the development of targeted lesson plans to address learning gaps.

**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.**

Ongoing professional development opportunities will be provided by our instructional trainer coaches around the Florida BEST Standards.

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

The LDC, math coach, and MTSS teacher will help in providing PD and support around the Eureka 50/50 Math Model. This model has shown great learning gains with schools with similar demographics. Academic Tutors will work with students to assist in closing student learning gaps. Also, the addition of instructional assistants in every kindergarten classroom will assist teachers in instilling foundational skills in our youngest students.

### 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 Standards-aligned Instruction**

Rationale: Student data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark.

ELA Proficiency-  
3rd Grade- 24%  
4th Grade- 36%  
5th Grade- 30%

Instructional Priority #1: Teachers deliver content, concept, or skill that is aligned to the benchmark knowledge and intended learning.  
a) By building capacity within the instructional coaches to assist teachers with monitoring student understanding and providing corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.  
b) By building capacity within the teachers by deepening their understanding of essential standards and utilizing data to inform instruction  
c) By building capacity within the students by ensuring the students are doing the majority of the work (Core Actions)

#### Core Action 1

A majority of the lesson is spent reading (listening K -2), writing or speaking about grade level aligned texts.

Teacher Actions:

- Intentionally planned to include all of the components of reading, writing and speaking. (These elements are visible in the instruction)
- Presence of grade level aligned text
- Speaking about the text/referring to the text
- All students have access to text (hard copy or digital)
- Multiple ways of responding to grade level text – (Annotating or Marking up text/Post It, RACE strategy)
- Core curriculum aligned to Grade level benchmarks are being utilized through speaking (listening K-2), reading, writing about the text.

#### Core Action 2

Employ questions and tasks both oral and written, that are text specific and accurately address the analytical thinking required by the grade level standards.

Questions and tasks require students to use evidence from the text to demonstrate and understanding and to support their ideas about the text. The ideas are expressed through written and oral responses.

#### Look Fors

Teacher Action

- Teachers are asking questions that addresses the text by attending to it's meaning /purpose and/or language, structured knowledge demands.
- Teacher is the facilitator
- Teacher and students using academic vocabulary
- Teacher expects students to use text evidence when supporting their thinking

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Questions and tasks are intentionally sequenced to build knowledge by guiding students to delve deeper into the text and graphics.

Core Action 3 – Provide all students with opportunities to engage in the grade level aligned work of the lesson.

Teacher Actions

- The teacher poses questions and tasks for students to do the majority of the work: speaking/listening, reading, and/or writing.
- The teacher cultivates reasoning and meaning making by allowing students the productive struggle.
- The teacher expects evidence and precision from students and probes students answers accordingly.
- The teacher creates the conditions for student conversations where students are encouraged to talk about each other's thinking.
- The teacher checks for understanding throughout the grade level aligned lesson.

Student Actions

- Students do the majority of the work
- Students persevere through difficulty
- Students referring back to the text
- Students provide text evidence to support their ideas
- Students talking/Conversations in order to clarify their thinking
- Students provide written response to grade level aligned text

Rating Scale for Learning Walkabout

Accomplished

Implementing

Not Yet Implemented

N/A

**Measurable Outcome:**  
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Measurable outcomes:

a) The Learning Walkabouts will reach a 100% proficiency of implementation and impact of targeted benchmark (based on items indicated in the IPG tool) by May 2023

b) Five out of six of the planning sessions will result in lesson plans being aligned to the benchmark and intended learning by October 2022

c) By May 2023, FAST student data will indicate an increase of 20% on each assessment \*\*\*\*\*

A. Evidence:

\*Teacher implementation reflects Core Action 2 of the IPG tool which is Employing Instructional Practices & Tasks Both Oral and Written (Questioning)

\*Teacher implementation reflects Core Action 3 of the IPG tool which releases the work to all students.

\*Student impact of 80% mastery of ELA BEST Benchmarks

\*Student impact of 80% mastery of the Math BEST Benchmarks

**Monitoring:**  
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Collected by weekly Learning Walkabouts to gather trend data on the

focused skill from the IPG tools and goals will be formed based on those trends.

B. Evidence:

- \*Completed planning-protocols
- \*Admin notes from planning- observations
- \*Aligned lesson plans will exhibit essential standards
- \*Student impact of aligned lesson plans would reflect benchmark aligned student tasks
- \*Students are able to articulate learning via Learning Walkabout collection data

C. Evidence:

- \*FAST data

\*\*\*Coaches Impact:

Trends over time show:

- \*Improvement in Learning Walkabout data identified teachers

How will you collect this evidence?

- \* Principal evaluation noting improvement in identified areas as evidence of coaching impact

Evidence:

- \*Tiered coaching support plan developed with Learning Walkabout Trends

How will you collect this evidence?

- \*Coaching schedule indicating focus, frequency, and method of support

- \*Coaching logs documenting support and next steps

\*\*\*Teacher Impact:

Trends over time showing an increase in:

- \*Teachers providing aligned tasks and modeling application of intended learning

- \*Teachers questioning to deepen understanding and using academic language

How will you collect this evidence?

Admin and coaching team will have Learning Walkabouts monitoring specific “look-fors”

\*\*\*Student Impact:

\*Students will show 80% mastery on an assigned task

How will you collect this evidence?

Reviewing student data at the grade level PLC's.

\*Student application of intended learning to complete task

\*Student use of academic language

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christina Twardosz (ctwardos@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Analyzing and reviewing trends over time across the grade levels. Communicating with teachers the best practices "look fors" (as indicated on the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG tool)). Research based strategies that have results in student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The leadership team will reflect on the trend data for that current week on the identified focused area. Principal will send a weekly email to update staff on the current trends and progress toward the identified focused area

#### **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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

## **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**

Biweekly teachers will have extended PLC's to plan and implement tier 2 and tier 3 targeted interventions for struggling students to close the learning gaps.

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

Biweekly teachers will have extended PLC's to plan and implement tier 2 and tier 3 targeted interventions for struggling students to close the learning gaps.

**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)**

By the end of June 2023, 50% of our Kindergarten, first and second grade students will show proficiently on the FAST assessment.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By the end of June 2023, 50% of our third, fourth and fifth grade students will show proficiently on the FAST assessment.

**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.

PLC's will include data drives where the team will analyze ELA data (HMH module assessments, common formative assessments and FAST). As a grade level team with coaches, will plan and include Core Actions 2 & 3 with the commitment to release the work to the students. Admin will meet with each teacher quarterly (9 weeks) to analyze and action plan around their individual data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Twardosz, Christina, ctwardos@pasco.k12.fl.us

**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. Â§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?

Yes

Teachers will follow the district curriculum provided on the Elementary Learning Network for lesson planning and common formative assessments.

**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?

Zearn 50/50 Model is evidence based and has shown increase in student achievement in Pasco County school with similar demographics.

**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
Our Learning Design Coach, Math Coach and Literacy Coach will conduct coaching cycles with instructional staff. Staff will be identified for coaching based on the trends with the Learning Walkabouts. Administration and coaches will meet weekly to discuss the coaching cycles and classroom data.	Twardosz, Christina, ctwardos@pasco.k12.fl.us

### 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.

There a number of things that WZES do throughout the school year to impact our school's culture and environment. Administration hosts a staff BBQ each quarter. We also organize various staff social activities. Several times throughout the year, themed spirit weeks are organized for school staff to have a bit of fun and enjoy one another's camaraderie. Scavenger hunts are held for staff every so often for some additional enjoyment. Our school has a School Advisory Council that meets 8 times throughout the year. This committee consists of: administration, classroom teachers, support staff and business partners.

Our district and school work closely with Gallup and survey our staff in October. Results from the survey are then shared with administration. The administrative team shares the results with the school leadership team and develops an Action Plan based on the results of the survey.

This year our school theme is : Set Sail, Adventure Awaits!

We are decorating the Media and PLC room Nautical theme. We will communicate throughout the year that we are a team and we all are responsible for ensuring that all our students get to the island (meet the standards).

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

Principal: Christina Twardosz- establishing a positive culture and creating, organizing, and monitoring various activities/systems/structures that create and maintain "positivity."

Assistant Principal: Lyna Correa- establishing a positive culture and creating, organizing, and monitoring various activities/systems/structures that create and maintain "positivity."

Leadership Team: Share information with grade level teams from administration.

School Advisory Team: advise and assist principal and assistant principal with the vision of the school

Social Committee: create engaging and fun activities for school staff to promote a positive culture