

Pasco County Schools

Woodland Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Woodland Elementary School

38203 HENRY DR, Zephyrhills, FL 33542

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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 Wrangler, Every Day!

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Craig, Clara	Principal	Lead staff and students at Woodland to ensure student achievement and safety through High Impact Instruction, Data Driven Decisions and Collaborative Culture.
Legg, Jodi	Other	Same as Principal

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We gather feedback and input from stakeholders for our yearly SIP development in the following ways: With School Staff during data chats, as well as surveys during out CNA process. Each grade level team looks at our grade level data as well as overall school data and trends. A survey is conducted to gather feedback for areas in need of support including academic coaching, resources for interventions, and behavior supports.

Parents are included in this process through school wide surveys, as well as through the School Advisory Council. Surveys are available and conducted after parent involvement activities, and during data shares in our School Advisory Council. Also included for valuable feedback are the School Advisory Council Stakeholder including community members, district liaison and school staff along with our parents. Through out the year, alls chool initiatives, data and programs are shared with parents, community members and business partners and staff members during out monthly School Advisory Council meetings, Community Leadership Council meetings and during parent involvement activities. Student Gallup survey data from out grade 5 Students as well as staff surveys provide feedback for shaping out SIP. We also gather data from our School, Priority and District Walkthroughs as we collect data for areas of strengths and areas of need (PD, Coaching) in our school classroom/learning

environments. Last but not least, state and district expectations are shared at all Principal meetings to be aligned to our school goals each year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP Monitoring happens in many ways:

Comparison of state testing data PM1 to PM2, to PM3 specifically to grade levels, class, sub groups and individual student data. We also monitor with school assessments (module assessments, CFA's, Performance tasks) for effective implementation of strategies before the final state assessments. With the data collected from our School, Priority and District Walkthroughs as we monitor for areas of strengths and areas of need (PD, Coaching) in our school classroom/learning environments, and adjust the SIP as needed to make sure we are working on the correct work based on real need of our students. Subgroup data is monitored in grade level data meetings each quarter, and goals are set, adjusted and monitored with our School Leadership Teams and Student Intervention Teams each Month. Teachers engage in weekly PLC's and weekly Curriculum and Instructional Planning using a lesson plan that includes action plans for use of engagement strategies, and interventions. Action planning around school based assessment data with the spotlight standards happens every 2 weeks or as needed following each assessment. Progress monitoring data is collected from the intervention groups that happen at least 3 days per week. Ongoing training is provided doe grade K-2 teachers for research based programs such as UFLI and Heggerty implementation, as well as for daily SIPPS for interventions. Coaches and Admin monitor implementation through data collection and walkthroughs, and feedback is provided for observed areas of strengths and areas in need of growth/support.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	3	11	32	27	26	0	0	0	99	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	6	9	6	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	50	26	0	0	76	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	60	23	0	0	83	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	47	0	0	0	0	0	47	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	24	19	16	0	0	0	59

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	6	16	19	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	11	32	27	26	28	0	0	0	127	
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	9	6	11	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	50	26	60	0	0	0	136	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	60	23	66	0	0	0	149	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	
level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	37	30	6	0	0	0	73	
course failure in ELA or math	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	8	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	24	19	16	9	0	0	0	68

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	2	16	19	4	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	11	32	27	26	28	0	0	0	127	
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	9	6	11	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	50	26	60	0	0	0	136	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	60	23	66	0	0	0	149	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	
level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	37	30	6	0	0	0	73	
course failure in ELA or math	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	8	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	24	19	16	9	0	0	0	68

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	2	16	19	4	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	28	47	53	40	52	56	29		
ELA Learning Gains				54			23		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			29		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement*	31	48	59	40	46	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				55			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			50		
Science Achievement*	43	50	54	32	50	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	61	59	45			55		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	190
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	4	1
ELL	40	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	4	2
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	21	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	33	Yes	1	
FRL	36	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	3	1
HSP	43			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	44			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	28			31			43					63
SWD	19			25			30				4	
ELL	31			35							4	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			30			42				4	
HSP	26			23			52				5	66
MUL	21			21							2	
PAC												
WHT	30			34			38				4	
FRL	26			28			40				5	63

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	54	56	40	55	48	32					45
SWD	15	48	50	22	52	50	10					
ELL	29	45	50	38	46		29					45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	17		29	32		25					
HSP	36	49	50	38	55	40	30					46
MUL	50	55		41	73							
PAC												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
WHT	43	62	64	43	57	51	35					
FRL	38	52	55	36	53	47	29					45

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	29	23	29	30	23	50	29					55
SWD	3	17	25	9	30	45	0					
ELL	19	39	40	21	30		15					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	6		14	6		15					
HSP	23	22	38	25	19	36	18					50
MUL	29			33								
PAC												
WHT	34	27	25	34	29	65	36					
FRL	25	23	31	26	22	45	26					57

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	37%	51%	-14%	54%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	55%	-24%	58%	-27%
03	2023 - Spring	22%	48%	-26%	50%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	29%	50%	-21%	59%	-30%
04	2023 - Spring	28%	54%	-26%	61%	-33%
05	2023 - Spring	34%	52%	-18%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	49%	-7%	51%	-9%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

State STAR and FAST Data for PM3: K ELA 43% 1st ELA 44% 2nd ELA 35% 3rd ELA 22% 4th ELA 31% 5th ELA 38%

Our State PM 3 ELA Data showed the lowest performance for 2022-23. This is a new test and a benchmark year, and we did show growth from PM1 to PM 3 in all grade levels except for grade 2. However proficiency is very low in all grade levels.

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

Grades 3, 4 and 5 showed the biggest declines. We had very little evidence of Tier 2 interventions during the school year as this was our focus for staff PD. Taking computer based assessments are a challenge for many of our students. We had very consistent Tier 3 Interventions using SIPPS and Lexia and growth was evident in our lowest 35% students at all grade levels.

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

Grade 3 ELA FAST PM3: 22% proficiency compared to the state average of 50%. Grade 3 students did not receive strong reading instruction in grades 1 and 2, and interventions for Tier 2 were not consistent. Resources used for Interventions and standards focus were not consistent.

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

Grade 4 ELA FAST PM3: 37% proficiency compared to the state 57%. Grade 4 teachers were a little more consistent with reading interventions with the teachers who had their reading endorsement. More

time with text interactions and high expectations for comprehension and vocabulary. Science teachers contributed to teaching writing.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance for Kindergarten is an area of concern and this also was reflected in their reading assessment data. Behavior office referrals increased.

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

1. Literacy: We are hyper focused on supporting grade 1 and 3, but also supporting grade K, 2, 4 and 5.
2. Behavior: We are implementing PBIS and Resiliency Lessons for morning meetings.
3. Parent Involvement: Each grade level will host a parent involvement activity each semester with a focus on academics and how parents can support their child.
4. Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions with action planning and progress monitoring
5. Strengthening our Tier 1 instruction, especially in ELA in all grade levels.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase Literacy proficiency in grades K-5 with all student including our sub groups of Free and Reduced Lunch, Hispanic students, Black Students, and Students with Disabilities. Based on our assessment data,

Measurable Outcome:

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

62% of all of our students in Grades K-5 will score as proficient in reading by PM3. All subgroups will increase proficiency to 62% in all grade levels as evidenced by STAR and FAST PM3 data compared to the PM3 data in 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Monitor PM1, PM2 and PM3 data for increase in proficiency in ELA and provide interventions and enrichments specific to student needs with progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

SIPPS intervention program

UFLI for Tier 1 for grades K and 1, and for interventions for Grade 2

Lexia for Tier 1, 2 and 3 based on student needs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will be engaged in strong Tier 1 Core Instruction that is based on BEST Standards. Using data from assessments, teacher will action plan for interventions based on criteria and resources list above and progress monitor daily when working with groups.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase attendance rates for all students, including subgroups of students with disabilities, students receiving free and reduced lunch, Black and Hispanic students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student attendance will improve from 60% to 80% by quarter 4.

Monitoring:

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

My School Intervention Team and I will monitor student attendance bi weekly to action plan and monitor communication with student families.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Using PBIS app for student points awarded for attendance. Keeping a data base of interventions provided by the child's teacher, SSAP Teacher Social Worker and Guidance Counselor.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Personally reaching out to families to problem solve through possible hardships hindering student attendance will increase the likelihood of student being in attendance. Communicating, providing incentives and building relationships with the child and family is key to attendance improvement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

As a system, the Pasco district is engaging in a continuous improvement process always, and annually, we have a more focused reflection to look forward to the next coming school year. During the year, each school reflects and responds to data at the minimum quarterly, and the system engages in regular Calibration Meetings throughout the school year. Additionally, after reflecting on current mid-year data, the system engages in Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). During this time, each school enters a needs assessment process that sets the stage for future planning and includes analysis of student performance, analysis of stakeholder feedback, self-assessment, and site visits. Subsequently, this analysis from each school drives the district planning process and the annual approach to Planning Forward to respond our schools, as well as the allocation of resources in an intentional manner based on the needs identified for each school.

Student Performance is analyzed by reviewing current and trend data by subgroup and school. Data sources include Florida BEST assessments, Statewide Science Assessment, district developed quarterly check results where applicable, and NWEA MAP Growth data. Stakeholder feedback is analyzed by reviewing results from both the student and staff Gallup polls, staff and parent surveys and focus groups.

Multiple tools are used to conduct a self-assessment. Each school and the district use the Cognia Standards for systems accreditation and each school and the district reviews and evaluates its progress toward goals set using the Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE). Instructional Practice Observations, Professional Learning Community (PLC) rubrics, and Tiers of Support rubrics are also completed by each school to gain insight into instructional and support practices.

An Assistant Superintendent, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Specialist, and District personnel engage in individual site visits with school leadership at each school after the school team has completed the first part of their analysis to gain insight into the school's unique needs as well as identify foci for school improvement efforts and needs for implementing the plan.

The conclusion of the CNA results in the identification of the root causes of barriers, the development of a school improvement plan to overcome/reduce barriers to improvement, the allocation of supports needed to implement each school's improvement plan and serves as the foundation for Planning Forward. Schools analyze their plans and basic allocations that will be provided based on district formulas to determine needs for additional allocations, resources and supports. With the school assistant superintendent and the school support team, each school then carefully aligns the additional available funds through Title 1 and/or UniSIG to specific strategies for improvement aimed at reducing barriers to achievement and closing learning gaps for underperforming student groups. This plan for use of additional funding is regularly monitored by the district support team, and is adjusted based on data, including student progress monitoring results, as applicable through the year, with the support of the state BSI team and the Department.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

For grades K-1 teachers will implement instruction using UFLI. To implement: Summer District Training and Quarter 1 school based trainings for every K-1 teacher as well as reading interventionists and Academic Tutors, and Grade 2 ELA teachers for use in Tiered interventions. Teachers will also engage in the UFLI Canvas Course and will be monitored with walkthrough observations, and data collected bi weekly. Heggarty strategies are used daily during the ELA block in primary grades, and coaching support and monitoring for our new and veteran teachers. Planning with coaches weekly is happening and the focus is on the spotlight standards with action planning for stacking standards. Tier 3 students are receiving ELA instruction daily in their intervention block using SIPPS with trained teachers who have reading endorsement. All teachers are action planning for Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups and collecting data for progress monitoring. Response to reading/text daily using writing journals along with writing lessons and free-write opportunities. Students have the opportunity to have text in hand daily with individual, partner and choral reading.

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

For grades 3-5: teachers will implement instruction using curriculum that meets the rigor of the ELA BEST Standards. For Tier 2 and 3 interventions the teachers will use Core Curriculum specific to the standard or strategy, as well as Lexia (explicit instruction, practice and assessment) To support implementation: Summer District Training for curriculum and student engagement, and Quarter 1, 2 and 3 school based trainings for every K-5 teacher as well as reading interventionists and Academic Tutors, for use in Tiered interventions. Teachers will be monitored with walkthrough observations, and data collected weekly and uploaded into their PLC Share point. Foundational, Vocabulary studies and Comprehension strategies are used daily during the ELA block in grades 3-5, with coaching support and monitoring for our new and veteran teachers. Teacher planning with coaches and PLC's are both happening weekly, and the focus is on the spotlight standards with action planning for stacking standards. Tier 3 students are receiving ELA instruction daily in their intervention block using SIPPS and Lexia with trained teachers who are reading endorsed. All teachers are action planning for Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups and collecting data for progress monitoring. Response to reading/text daily using writing journals along with writing lessons and free-write opportunities. Students have the opportunity to have text in hand daily with individual, partner and choral reading. Text annotation and accountable talk is the expectation when interacting with text.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

The measurable outcome for our K-2 students who score below level 3 is 62% or higher on all school based and state assessments (PM 3) With Tier 2 and 3 interventions as well as being provided a strong Tier 1/core curriculum daily, students will make learning gains from PM1 to PM 2 and 3, and learning gains in DIBELS progression over the year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The measurable outcome for our 3-5 students who score below level 3 is 62% or higher on all school based and state assessments (PM 3) With Tier 2 and 3 interventions as well as being provided a strong Tier 1/core curriculum daily, students will make learning gains from PM1 to PM 2 and 3, and learning gains in DIBELS progression over the year. On the FAST ELA 2023, our overall proficiency was below 50% which is also reflected on our DIBELS data as well.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

For monitoring for the desired outcomes, Admin and coaches will disaggregate the data after each assessment period with the teacher to plan for instruction, intervention groups with resources and how to monitor. Each BEST spotlight standard is posted in our PLC room with student names. Progress monitoring with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be posted in the PLC share point folders and also shared with our student services team for further recommendations based on the data. Student will be looked at through the lens of our subgroups and for learning gains as well as mastery (level 3).

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Craig, Clara , ccraig@pasco.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

For grades K-1 teachers will implement instruction using UFLI. To implement: Summer District Training and Quarter 1 school based trainings for every K-1 teacher as well as reading interventionists and Academic Tutors, and Grade 2 ELA teachers for use in Tiered interventions. Teachers will also engage in the UFLI Canvas Course and will be monitored with walkthrough observations, and data collected bi weekly. Heggarty strategies are used daily during the ELA block in primary grades, and coaching support and monitoring for our new and veteran teachers. Planning with coaches weekly is happening and the focus is on the spotlight standards with action planning for stacking standards. Tier 3 students are receiving ELA instruction daily in their intervention block using SIPPS with trained teachers who have reading endorsement. All teachers are action planning for Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups and collecting data for progress monitoring. Response to reading/text daily using writing journals along with writing lessons and free-write opportunities. Students have the opportunity to have text in hand daily with individual, partner and choral reading.

For grades 3-5: teachers will implement instruction using curriculum that meets the rigor of the ELA BEST Standards. For Tier 2 and 3 interventions the teachers will use Core Curriculum/ Early Learning Network resources specific to the standard or strategy, as well as Lexia (explicit instruction, practice and assessment) To support implementation: Summer District Training for curriculum and student engagement, and Quarter 1, 2 and 3 school based trainings for every K-5 teacher as well as reading interventionists and Academic Tutors, for use in Tiered interventions. Teachers will be monitored with walkthrough observations, and data collected weekly and uploaded into their PLC Share point. Foundational, Vocabulary studies and Comprehension strategies are used daily during the ELA block in grades 3-5, with coaching support and monitoring for our new and veteran teachers. Teacher planning with coaches and PLC's are both happening weekly, and the focus is on the spotlight standards with action planning for stacking standards. Tier 3 students are receiving ELA instruction daily in their intervention block using SIPPS and Lexia with trained teachers who are reading endorsed. All teachers are action planning for Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups and collecting data for progress monitoring. Response to reading/text daily using writing journals along with writing lessons and free-write opportunities. Students have the opportunity to have text in hand daily with individual, partner and choral reading. Text annotation and accountable talk is the expectation when interacting with text.

All K-5 students who are identified as ESOL, will receive extra support from our ESOL Resource Teacher, the class teacher and through use of daily exposure to the English Language and the Imagine Learning Program.

All K-5 students who are identified as ESE will receive extra support from our ESE Resource Teacher, the class teacher with meeting the student goals on the IEP and through small group or individual instruction and with the Lexia Learning Program.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All the practices and programs listed above are research based and are recommended for our Pasco County students. Teachers are trained and in many cases are required to have reading endorsement in order to implement the practice/program for our targeted population at Woodland.

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
<p>Provide Professional Learning to Instructional and non instructional Staff: School based and district based training for UFLI, Heggerty, SIPPS In weekly planning and PLC's teachers will be coached and supported to identify the spotlight standards and how to stack other standards Data chats will include how to action plan for interventions, resources and criteria for entry and exit of small groups, and how to progress monitor the interventions for desired outcomes.</p>	Craig, Clara , ccraig@pasco.k12.fl.us
<p>Literacy Leadership: Monthly Meetings for data analysis and trends with our walkthrough data Intentionally plan for engagement strategies with each weekly lesson/unit of study during weekly planning</p>	Craig, Clara , ccraig@pasco.k12.fl.us
<p>Literacy Coaching: Weekly curriculum planning to align with Best Standards with Assessment Task in mind Natural creation of Anchor charts to be developed with students and displayed for student use Daily walkthroughs by admin and coaching team for monitoring and developing teaching and learning that aligns with Priority Core Actions</p>	Craig, Clara , ccraig@pasco.k12.fl.us
<p>Assessment: Develop assessments that align with BEST Standards, and monitor assessments provided by Pasco for alignment. Ensure implementation of assessment and use of data is coordinated across the grade level Require teachers to engage in error analysis after assessments with students Teams will create interventions, and progress monitor with assessments for evidence of mastery</p>	Craig, Clara , ccraig@pasco.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

To provide methods of dissemination of the SIP and SWP:

This information will be provided to our parents and families at the School Advisory COuncil Meeting in October 2023, as well as during our Community Leadership Council (Community Partners and Feeder Pattern Schools) during Semester 1.

Share with School Staff during planning week and throughout the year to keep our focus on our goals and to review/revise if needed based on outcome data.

Share with School Assistant Superintendent and District Support Team during out Priority School

meetings each quarter.

Post on our school webpage at wes@pasco.k12.fl.us and have a copy in our front office for parents to view. Post the SIP in meeting areas in our school to refer to.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

To build Positive Relationships with out school community:

Communication through weekly calls, emails and texts, Wednesday Folders, Messages to parents in MyStudent and through the use of our PBIS ap.

Quarterly Conference nights with each grade level team

Each Semester grade level parent engagement activities that support student and child supports at home.

Monthly All Pro Dad's meetings, School Advisory Meetings, and PTO meetings, Wrangler of the Month Family Celebrations

Title 1 Meeting with our Open House Quarter 1

Post Family Engagement Plan on our school webpage at wes@pasco.k12.fl.us and have a copy in our front office for parents to view. Post the Family Engagement Plan and SIP in meeting areas in our school to refer to.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Accelerated Math at Grade 3

Gifted endorsed teachers on staff to support teachers with students in need of an enriched curriculum

Teachers will specialize in grades 2-5; ELA and STEM

Weekly Planning to support all tiers of instruction, and how to monitor interventions/enrichments.

Half day Planning/PD with coaches during Quarter 1

Staff participated in PD for Writing, SIPPS, UFLI, Kagan Cooperative Structures for engagement

Use of School Staff and Volunteers for Tier 2 Reading practice

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

All programs are developed through the expectations and approval of the State of FL DOE, and our District School Board of Pasco County. All Lesson plans can be made public and all resources are approved by state and district.