

Pasco County Schools

# Bayonet Point Middle School



## 2019-20 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>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Bayonet Point Middle School

11125 LITTLE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Cindy Jack**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2014

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 87%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (47%)<br>2017-18: C (41%)<br>2016-17: C (42%)<br>2015-16: C (41%)<br>2014-15: C (42%)  |
| <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>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |

| ESSA Status  | TS&I |
|--|------|
| * 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>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Bayonet Point Middle School

11125 LITTLE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 80%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 35%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | 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.**

Reaching Every Student every day.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Empowering tomorrow's problem solvers to change the world.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name               | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Babiarz, Martha    | Instructional Coach | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/Instructional_Learning_Design_Coach_06.02.15.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/Instructional_Learning_Design_Coach_06.02.15.pdf</a>   |
| Carrino, Shelley   | Principal           | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/admin/Prin_Middle.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/admin/Prin_Middle.pdf</a>   |
| Wild, Kathy        | Assistant Principal | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/admin/Ast_Prin_Middle.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/admin/Ast_Prin_Middle.pdf</a>   |
| Causey, Steven     | Instructional Coach | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/Instructional_Learning_Design_Coach_06.02.15.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/Instructional_Learning_Design_Coach_06.02.15.pdf</a>   |
| Cline, Lori        | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf</a> |
| Wiest, Bret        | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/graduation_enhancement_teacher.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/graduation_enhancement_teacher.pdf</a>   |
| Thompson, Cynthia  | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/graduation_enhancement_teacher.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/graduation_enhancement_teacher.pdf</a>   |
| Newton, James      | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf</a> |
| Peterson, Joshua   | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf</a> |
| Stern, Lacie       | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf</a> |
| Mulvey, Laura      | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf</a> |
| Babiarz, Mark      | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf</a> |
| jacobsen, Michelle | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf</a> |
| Barrow, Lyndsay    | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf</a> |



| Name            | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| D'Avanzo, Kate  | Teacher, K-12       | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf</a> |
| Caruso, Melissa | Assistant Principal | <a href="http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/admin/Ast_Prin_Middle.pdf">http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/admin/Ast_Prin_Middle.pdf</a>   |

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 305 | 293 | 266 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 864 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64  | 50  | 48  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 162 |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32  | 75  | 71  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 178 |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  | 38  | 49  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 111 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 105 | 98  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 314 |       |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 77 | 78 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 211 |       |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |   |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8 |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |   |       |

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

35

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/13/2019

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 43%    | 52%      | 54%   | 39%    | 50%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 49%    | 55%      | 54%   | 44%    | 52%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 47%    | 47%      | 47%   | 37%    | 40%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            | 49%    | 60%      | 58%   | 39%    | 53%      | 56%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 52%    | 61%      | 57%   | 44%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42%    | 52%      | 51%   | 44%    | 48%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 41%    | 52%      | 51%   | 29%    | 45%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 52%    | 68%      | 72%   | 53%    | 70%      | 70%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         | Total   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                 | 6                                 | 7       | 8       |         |
| Number of students enrolled     | 305 (0)                           | 293 (0) | 266 (0) | 864 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 64 (0)                            | 50 (0)  | 48 (0)  | 162 (0) |
| One or more suspensions         | 32 (0)                            | 75 (0)  | 71 (0)  | 178 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 24 (0)                            | 38 (0)  | 49 (0)  | 111 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 111 (0)                           | 105 (0) | 98 (0)  | 314 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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 |
| 06                    | 2019 | 42%    | 56%      | -14%                       | 54%   | -12%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 39%    | 51%      | -12%                       | 52%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 42%    | 51%      | -9%                        | 52%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 38%    | 51%      | -13%                       | 51%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 41%    | 58%      | -17%                       | 56%   | -15%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 41%    | 58%      | -17%                       | 58%   | -17%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 42%    | 59%      | -17%                       | 55%   | -13%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 42%    | 53%      | -11%                       | 52%   | -10%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 34%    | 42%      | -8%                        | 54%   | -20%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 34%    | 44%      | -10%                       | 54%   | -20%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 51%    | 68%      | -17%                       | 46%   | 5%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 45%    | 63%      | -18%                       | 45%   | 0%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 17%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                    | 2019 | 38%    | 54%      | -16%                       | 48%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 30%    | 53%      | -23%                       | 50%   | -20%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |

| CIVICS EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year       | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019       | 51%    | 70%      | -19%                  | 71%   | -20%               |
| 2018       | 46%    | 71%      | -25%                  | 71%   | -25%               |
| Compare    |        | 5%       |                       |       |                    |

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

| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 95%    | 60%      | 35%                   | 61%   | 34%                |
| 2018        | 77%    | 63%      | 14%                   | 62%   | 15%                |
| Compare     |        | 18%      |                       |       |                    |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 0%     | 62%      | -62%                  | 57%   | -57%               |
| 2018         | 0%     | 60%      | -60%                  | 56%   | -56%               |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |

### Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 24       | 42     | 40          | 25        | 42      | 33           | 26       | 21      | 20        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 18       | 34     | 32          | 14        | 35      | 38           | 9        | 42      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 85       | 55     |             | 69        | 83      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 25       | 29     | 25          | 27        | 40      | 41           | 21       | 31      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 31       | 45     | 45          | 31        | 42      | 38           | 18       | 51      | 44        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 43       | 48     |             | 52        | 43      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 48       | 52     | 50          | 57        | 56      | 43           | 48       | 55      | 48        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 46     | 45          | 44        | 49      | 39           | 32       | 50      | 48        |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 21       | 37     | 32          | 28        | 46      | 35           | 23       | 44      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 19       | 32     | 27          | 11        | 32      | 35           |          | 27      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 34       | 38     |             | 36        | 53      | 27           | 36       | 23      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 35       | 40     | 22          | 31        | 46      | 38           | 38       | 36      | 26        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 30       | 27     |             | 52        | 50      |              | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 44       | 46     | 43          | 50        | 56      | 43           | 27       | 53      | 33        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 37       | 42     | 33          | 42        | 52      | 41           | 32       | 45      | 24        |                   |                     |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 14       | 27     | 28          | 17        | 44      | 43           | 6        | 18      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 26       | 37     | 33          | 21        | 36      | 31           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 23       | 44     | 38          | 24        | 52      | 43           |          | 50      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 31       | 41     | 32          | 30        | 38      | 41           | 24       | 47      | 50        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 48       | 35     |             | 48        | 63      |              |          | 64      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 41       | 45     | 39          | 42        | 44      | 40           | 31       | 55      | 42        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 35       | 42     | 36          | 35        | 41      | 45           | 25       | 53      | 43        |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 49   |
| 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 | 65   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 489  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested   | 97% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 30  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 32  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| 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%        |     |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 73  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 30  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 41  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 47  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |

| 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%           |     |
| 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%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 46  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our science achievement score is the lowest data point from the 2018/2019 performance data. We have seen a high degree of turnover in the department over the last two years. Even though this department had the lowest achievement data, it was one of the largest improvements over previous years. Our science proficiency scores from 2017 to 2019 are: 29%, 32%, 41%.

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

Our only data point with any kind of decline is our Math Learning Gains, which dropped from 53% in 2018 to 52% in 2019. Given the nature of the statistic, we are confident that this does not actually represent a decline in performance.

**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.**

Social Studies achievement showed the greatest gap compared to state averages, with a 20 point spread. We have had 100% turnover in this department over the last two years. Over the past few years, the teachers holding these positions have only had one or two years experience. We are confident that our performance will improve as we hire and retain high quality teachers.

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

ELA Learning Gains for our lowest 25% grew from 34% in 2018 to 47% in 2019. This increase in student achievement can be attributed to two primary factors. First, our excellent teachers spent a significant amount of time identifying essential standards, administering common formative assessments (comprehension checks, quarterlies), and then delivering targeted interventions to struggling students. Second, our work with TNTTP has coached teachers in the use of effective questioning, which is supporting our students in pulling information from texts and building an argument based on evidence.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

There are two primary areas of concern in our EWS data. First, our suspension rate jumps between 6th grade (32 students) and 7th grade (75 students). We are fine tuning our positive behavior interventions and supports system. As teachers learn how to positively engage their students, we should see these numbers reduce. Second, the number of 8th grade students with course failures in ELA or Math is cause for concern. We are coaching teachers in best grading practices. Our district is refining their expectations too. This should result in a shift toward grading practices that are more learning-focused, creating opportunities for students to improve their grade when new leaning occurs.

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

1. Staff will aligning instruction to the rigor of the standard (Success Plan Goal 1)
2. Staff will design learning experience that align to the shifts associated with the instructional practice guide (Success Plan Goal 1)
3. Staff will successfully complete assessment-intervention cycles for essential standards and provide students with second chance learning opportunities
4. Staff will build positive relationships through the use of Trauma Informed Care, different verbal and non-verbal de-escalation (Success Plan Goal 2)

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



| #1  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | High Impact Instruction   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Students who are on track in their classes will be engaged and successful.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Quarterly, the number of academic on track students will be above 80%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Teachers will provide differentiated learning opportunities and use facilitation questions that align to the rigor of each standard. The design process will be integrated into the learning through the use of Authentic Learning Units requiring students to solve real-world problems. Assessment - Intervention cycles (Taking Action: RTI at Work) will be used to provide struggling students with specific, targeted interventions. Teachers will plan and evaluate lessons using the instructional practice guide to ensure that learning is aligned to the instructional shifts associated with common core standards and FSAs. Teachers will engage in monthly walkthroughs and reflective practices using the IPG. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Attention to the rigor of the standard will ensure that learning opportunities are at the appropriate level for each subject and grade ( <a href="https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/">https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/</a> ). Our problem-based learning approach (Authentic Learning Units) will ensure that students are engaged (Ongoing professional development with IDE coaches). The work with the instructional practice guide will ensure that teachers are utilizing best practices as they engage students ( <a href="https://achievethecore.org/page/2730/aligned-instructional-practice">https://achievethecore.org/page/2730/aligned-instructional-practice</a> ).  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide ongoing support as teachers identify essential standards and write lessons</li> <li>2. Provide ongoing support and coaching as teachers use the Instructional Practice Guide to plan learning opportunities for their content areas.</li> <li>3. Provide ongoing support on problem-based learning through IDE coaches</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)  |

| #2  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Collaborative Culture   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Student and staff disengagement feed all of our weaknesses. Student discipline is not as effective with a disengaged staff, leading to a higher number of suspensions. Student disengagement leads to an increased number of course failures. If we can repair teacher/student relationships, we will see these metrics improve.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Utilize PBIS and Trauma Informed Care strategies to increase student and staff engagement to focus on developing more positive relationships between staff and students. This can be measured through the use of our student/staff Gallup poll, the number of course failures, the number of second chance learning opportunities, and the number of student discipline issues.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Our staff is being trained in trauma informed care and verbal & nonverbal de-escalation. Additionally, our behavior specialists will engage some teachers in relationship coaching, helping them form positive relationships with struggling students.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Evidence shows that a trauma informed approach is particularly important in schools with a high number of adverse childhood experiences (The Harmony Project). By utilizing a trauma informed approach, we help students move to a place where engagement and learning are possible.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Engage all staff in phase 2 and 3 of Trauma Informed Care Training</li> <li>2. Ongoing support in Social Emotional Learning through our professional development half day schedules</li> <li>3. Ongoing support in differentiated verbal and nonverbal de-escalation</li> <li>4. Ongoing support by "campus champions" to coach teachers in building relationships with challenging students</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)  |

| #3  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Data driven decisions  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Students who are on track in their classes will be engaged and successful.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Quarterly, the number of academic on track students will be above 80%. Assessment - Intervention cycles (Taking Action: RTI at Work) will be used to provide struggling students with specific, targeted interventions. Teachers will engage in 2 or more of these cycles each quarter.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Teachers will identify essential standards, frequently check for understanding through the use of common formative assessments, and provide tier 2 interventions responsive to the data collected through formative assessments.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Research shows that timely, targeted interventions correlate stronger with student proficiency than almost any other factor, including classroom teachers. By engaging students in assessment - intervention cycles, as defined in Taking Action: RTI at work, we will be ensuring that all students are provided every opportunity to learn. Additionally, teachers will be required to shift their focus from teaching to learning as they measure student performance and provide responsive interventions. |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relaunch PLCs by clarifying expectations for assessment-intervention cycles.</li> <li>2. Provide ongoing support in identifying essential standards, writing common formative assessments, and designing/delivering targeted interventions for struggling students.</li> <li>3. Provide ongoing support in identifying students needing tiered 2 interventions</li> </ol>  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)   |

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

NA