Woodland Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Woodland Elementary School

38203 HENRY DR, Zephyrhills, FL 33542

https://wes.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Clara Craig

Start Date for this Principal: 6/6/2022

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (46%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.](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

Woodland Elementary School

38203 HENRY DR, Zephyrhills, FL 33542

https://wes.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	47%

School Grades History

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

Woodland Elementary School is a Positive Learning Community which Inspires, Challenges, and Empowers toward Excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Promoting a Culture of Excellence at Woodland - Every Child, Every Day!

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
Craig, Clara	Principal	Leads the administrative and instructional functions, to meet the educational needs of students, and to carry out the mission and goals of the schools and the district.
Wallen, Heather	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with administrative and instructional functions, to meet the educational needs of students, and to carry out the mission and goals of the schools and the district.
Griffone, Jennifer	Math Coach	Responsible for supporting the professional growth of teachers through coaching and collaboration to provide supports for effective implementation of district and school initiatives in order to impact teaching and learning.
Gunn, Michael	Instructional Coach	Responsible for supporting the professional growth of teachers through coaching and collaboration to provide supports for effective implementation of district and school initiatives in order to impact teaching and learning.
Kelly, Elena	Reading Coach	Responsible for supporting the professional growth of teachers through coaching and collaboration to provide supports for effective implementation of district and school initiatives in order to impact teaching and learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/6/2022, Clara Craig

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

813

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

23

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

15

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	149	119	121	132	123	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	762
Attendance below 90 percent	3	11	32	27	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	9	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	50	26	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	60	23	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	37	30	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
course failure in ELA or math	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
59	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	24	19	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	1	0	2	16	19	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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 9/6/2022

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	117	105	125	140	100	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	739
Attendance below 90 percent	11	26	22	33	26	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	6	6	8	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	49	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	42	3	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course Failure in ELA or math	0	4	2	10	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	22	14	23	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	117	105	125	140	100	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	739
Attendance below 90 percent	11	26	22	33	26	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	6	6	8	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	49	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	42	3	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course Failure in ELA or math	0	4	2	10	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	22	14	23	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	40%	52%	56%				44%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						48%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						46%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	40%	46%	50%				47%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						60%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						45%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	50%	59%				38%	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	44%	60%	-16%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	59%	-7%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	36%	55%	-19%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	39%	59%	-20%	62%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	37%	53%	-16%	53%	-16%
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	15	48	50	22	52	50	10				
ELL	29	45	50	38	46		29				
BLK	26	17		29	32		25				
HSP	36	49	50	38	55	40	30				
MUL	50	55		41	73						
WHT	43	62	64	43	57	51	35				
FRL	38	52	55	36	53	47	29				
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	3	17	25	9	30	45					
ELL	19	39	40	21	30		15				
BLK	17	6		14	6		15				
HSP	23	22	38	25	19	36	18				
MUL	29			33							
WHT	34	27	25	34	29	65	36				
FRL	25	23	31	26	22	45	26				
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	16	42	45	22	51	49	7				
ELL	15	17	18	27	58	47	5				
BLK	28	56		33	48		27				
HSP	41	42	29	46	63	56	24				
MUL	38	25		27	57						
WHT	49	52	55	50	60	39	49				

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
FRL	39	44	44	42	58	45	31				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	40
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	55
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	51
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	44
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?

K ELA (this year's 1st): 25% proficiency (MAP)
1 ELA (this year's 2nd): 70% proficiency (MAP)
2 ELA (this year's 3rd): 59% proficiency (MAP)

3 ELA (this year's 4th): (FSA)
4 ELA (this year's 5th): (FSA)
5 ELA (this year's 6th): (FSA)
K Math (this year's 1st): 18% proficiency (MAP)
1 Math (this year's 2nd): 54% proficiency (MAP)
2 Math (this year's 3rd): 67% proficiency (MAP)
3 Math (this year's 4th): (MAP)
4 Math (this year's 5th): (MAP)
5 Math (this year's 6th): (MAP)

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

Based on the past 3 years of FSA scores, all grade levels 3, 4, and 5 need to increase proficiency in Science, Math and ELA. Based on Walk through data, T1 needs strengthened, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions were not in place consistently.

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

Based on Walk through data, T1 instruction needs strengthened, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions were not in place consistently. Based on School assessment MAPS data 50% or more students did not demonstrate proficiency.

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

FSA Data from 2020 testing to 2021 testing showed a 100 point increase in overall FSA Points. In ELA, Math and Science percentages increased by at least 10% or higher. Learning gains in Math and ELA increase by at least 30%.

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

Students were back in school classrooms after being out for COVID, and with the hybrid model of students having the option of distance learning since 2020. Our staff implemented a new district Reading series (HMH) during the 21-22 school year which increased rigor of instruction and learning in most classes.

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

Training teachers to implement cooperative structures for increased student engagement, Coach supported unit and lesson planning, Data analysis, intervention action planning and monitoring by grade level teams. Extended school day opportunities, Lit Camp and Tutoring, for our lowest 35% students from October through April. Monitoring our FAST/Renaissance Data points for progress monitoring and intervention/enrichment planning.

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.

Early Release Day Training:
Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention/MTSS -Analyzing data, Forming intervention groups with entrance and exit criteria
Weekly Coaching: 50/50 math support, Kagan structures training, intentional HMH and Science Planning

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

System of support (MTSS) will be in place and continue with Tier 2/3 district intervention walkthroughs, data chats and planning for T1 instruction will continue with T1 walkthroughs using core action tool (IPG), ALso included in goals and strategies in our school Success Plan.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Proficiency levels for math and ELA are below 45% as evidence on school assessments, FSA data and Fast /Renaissance Data.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the 2022-23 school year, our student proficiency scores will increase to at least 50% in all grade levels based on FAST/Renaissance data and School assessment data.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Fast/Renaissance window 1 and 2, and school-wide data each quarter. Tier 2 and 3 data monitoring and LEXIA, DIBELS, and ZEARN data will be monitored and action plans implemented.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clara Craig (ccraig@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Extended School Day (RAISE GRANT and Title 1) for ELA K-4 and Math 1-5 instruction, Kagan Cooperative Structures, MTSS Implementation for Tier 2 and Tier 3 action planning, implementation and monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Resources include: ELA-SIPPS, LEXIA Core 5, and Lit Camp Math-Equip, and Zearn

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.

Tier 3 Plan in place and implemented for ELA
September MTSS Training, District and school based Walkthroughs, Data chats, Tier 2 schedule started-Admin and Coaches, District Coaches
October MTSS Action Planning with Interventions during Tier 2 scheduled times, DIstrict and School based Walkthroughs, Check in and Action Plan for T3 as Needed-Admin and Coaches, District Coaches
November MTSS Monitoring/ Reporting training, Tier 2 Walkthroughs, Time for Action Planning T2 and T3, Tiered Coaching Cycles-Admin and Coaches, District Coaches
December MTSS Training-walkthrough data and problem-solving around data, Tiered Coaching cycles around observations and data-Admin and Coaches, District Coaches
Jan through May: Monthly MTSS Monitoring, Walkthroughs, Action Planning time, implementation monitoring, data collection monitoring, Tiered Coaching Cycles, Extended School Day programs : Tutoring and Lit Camp, Math Camp-Admin and Coaches, District Coaches

Person Responsible	Clara Craig (ccraig@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behavior	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Wallen (hwallen@pasco.k12.fl.us) Increase staff and student engagement Increase family engagement
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Monthly Staff and Student Celebrations Staff will engage in content area planning Increase Community Involvement by establishing School and Business Partnerships with the Zephyrhills Community PBIS Rewards Application
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Parent Surveys Family Event Sign In Sheets Community Leadership Council/SAC Membership

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

K: 25% Level 2 or Below on NWEA
1st: 70% Level 2 or Below on NWEA
2nd: 59% Level 2 or Below on NWEA

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

3rd: 55% Level 2 or Below on FSA
4th: 44% Level 2 or Below on FSA
5th: 85% Level 2 or Below on FSA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Using FAST Renaissance Data:
Grade K: 48% Proficient-Increase Math Proficiency to 50% or higher through:Math Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school Math Camp 3x per week
Grade 1: 50% or higher Proficiency
Grade 2: Less than 30% Proficiency: Increase Math Proficiency to 50% or higher through:Math Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school Math Camp 3x per week
Reading:
Grade K: 37% Proficient- Increase ELA Proficiency to 50% or higher through: ELA Tier 2 and Tier 3

intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school ELA Camp 3x per week, IA Tutoring with Sound Partners, Lexia, Imagine Learning

Grade 1: 60% Proficient- Increase ELA Proficiency to 50% or higher through: ELA Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school ELA Camp 3x per week, Lexia, SIPPS, Imagine Learning

Grade 2: 28% Proficient-Increase ELA Proficiency to 50% or higher through: ELA Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention, Lexia, SIPPS groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school ELA Camp 3x per week, Imagine Learning

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Math:

Grade 3-41% Proficiency- Increase Math Proficiency to 50% or higher through:Math Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school Math Camp 3x per week

Grade 4- 21% Proficiency-Increase Math Proficiency to 50% or higher through:Math Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school Math Camp 3x per week

Grade 5-29% Proficiency-Increase Math Proficiency to 50% or higher through:Math Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school Math Camp 3x per week

Reading:

Grade 3: 7% Proficiency-Increase ELA Proficiency to 50% or higher through: ELA Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school ELA Camp 3x per week, Lexia, SIPPS, Imagine Learning

Grade 4: 12% Proficiency-Increase ELA Proficiency to 50% or higher through: ELA Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school ELA Camp 3x per week, Lexia, SIPPS, Imagine Learning

Grade 5: 19%Proficiency-Increase ELA Proficiency to 50% or higher through: ELA Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school ELA Camp 3x per week, Lexia, SIPPS, Imagine Learning

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.

Math: Quarterly monitoring of all data from programs listed in B, and walkthroughs will be conducted, All data analyzed and action planned around.
Reading: Quarterly Monitoring of all data from programs listed in B, a and Walkthroughs will be conducted, All data analyzed and action planned around.

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

Craig, Clara , ccraig@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?

Math For grades K-5: Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction.: 50/50 model. After school Math Camp 3x per week using Zearn/Eureka Math
ELA for Grades K-5: ELA Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups, Coaches will work with teachers to strengthen Tier 1 Instruction. After school ELA Camp 3x per week, Lexia, SIPPS, Imagine Learning

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?

All resources listed above are evidence based programs and practices given to us by our Pasco County District

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
Tier 3 Plan in place and implemented for ELA September MTSS Training, District and school based Walkthroughs, Data chats, Tier 2 schedule started- Admin and Coaches, District Coaches October MTSS Action Planning with Interventions during Tier 2 scheduled times, DIstrict and School based Walkthroughs, Check in and Action Plan for T3 as Needed-Admin and Coaches, District Coaches November MTSS Monitoring/ Reporting training, Tier 2 Walkthroughs, Time for Action Planning T2 and T3, Tiered Coaching Cycles-Admin and Coaches, District Coaches December MTSS Training-walkthrough data and problem-solving around data, Tiered Coaching cycles around observations and data-Admin and Coaches, District Coaches Jan through May: Monthly MTSS Monitoring, Walkthroughs, Action Planning time, implementation monitoring, data collection monitoring, Tiered Coaching Cycles, Extended School Day programs : Tutoring and Lit Camp, Math Camp-Admin and Coaches, District Coaches	Craig, Clara , ccraig@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.

Students: The number of discipline referrals will decrease by 20%. Morning Meetings, PBIS, Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions for Behavior, Wrangler of the Month, National Elementary Honor Society, Drop Out Prevention Groups weekly, Guidance lessons, After school learning and celebrations quarterly

Staff: Our Gallup employee survey will increase by 10%. Coaching support, mentoring, Peer Walkthrough opportunities, Monthly staff events, Staff recognitions, Monthly Staff feedback with glows and grows from School based staff and district staff

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

Increase staff engagement -Coaches and Admin
student engagement - Teachers, Coaches, Admin

Increase family engagement -Teachers, Coaches, Admin

Monthly Staff and Student Celebrations -Teachers, Coaches, Admin

Staff will engage in content area planning -Teachers, Coaches, Admin

Increase Community Involvement by establishing School and Business Partnerships with the Zephyrhills Community -Parent Coordinator and Admin