

Pasco County Schools

Achieve Center Of Pasco



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Achieve Center Of Pasco

18950 MICHIGAN LN, Spring Hill, FL 34610

www.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Paul Lipinski

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Achieve Center Of Pasco

18950 MICHIGAN LN, Spring Hill, FL 34610

www.pasco.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

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.

Our mission is to provide a safe and engaging learning environment where students are encouraged and empowered. We strive to inspire student success through individualized academic support as well as social/emotional instruction focused on creating productive citizens of the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students achieving success in college, in career, and life.

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
Lipinski, Paul	Principal	Lead the implementation of academic, behavioral and social/emotional success for students. Lead the development and implementation of intervention systems through the use of data and a well rounded team leadership team.
Holyoke, Shawn	Assistant Principal	Lead the implementation of academic, behavioral and social/emotional success for students. Lead the development and implementation of intervention systems through the use of data and a well rounded team leadership team.

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	2	3	21	17	12	8	5	68
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	13	9	6	5	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	15	9	7	3	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	11	10	6	5	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	10	4	5	3	38

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	1	2	21	15	10	7	5	61

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	17	0	0	0	3	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	2	11

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

12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/31/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	0%	57%	56%	0%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	51%	0%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	41%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	56%	51%	0%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	49%	48%	0%	45%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	45%	0%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	70%	68%	0%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	73%	73%	0%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	2 (0)	3 (0)	21 (0)	17 (0)	12 (0)	8 (0)	5 (0)	68 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	2 ()	20 ()	13 ()	9 ()	6 ()	5 ()	56 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	2 ()	19 ()	15 ()	9 ()	7 ()	3 ()	55 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	2 ()	17 ()	11 ()	10 ()	6 ()	5 ()	51 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1 ()	2 ()	13 ()	10 ()	4 ()	5 ()	3 ()	38 (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	0%	56%	-56%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	8%	58%	-50%	56%	-48%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
09	2019	0%	57%	-57%	55%	-55%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	59%	-59%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	42%	-42%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	6%	68%	-62%	46%	-40%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	54%	-54%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	7%	70%	-63%	71%	-64%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	71%	-71%	71%	-71%
Compare		7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	70%	-70%
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	60%	-60%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
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		30		6	20						
WHT				8							
FRL		30		6	20			10			
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											
WHT											
FRL											
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											
WHT											
FRL											

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)	CS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	10
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	60
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	69%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	4
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	13
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Of areas tested Math was the lowest data set of students meeting proficiency at 6%.

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

Due to previous year's percent of students tested there were no reported data sets to compare to.

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.

There was a 48% gap in school to state average for ELA.

Some factors that contribute to the gap is that students are here temporarily and have shown academic and behavioral challenges at multiple schools.

Trend data is hard to determine as the school historical data is not present to compare over time.

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

ELA proficiency was the highest measure at 8%. This year our school focused on reading intervention utilizing the IRLA program as well as Learning Ally to access texts. We had defined reading times in class.

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

Attendance was one of the highest areas of concern. If students are not in attendance they cannot make as much progress academically and behaviorally.

Suspensions was another high area of concern followed by academic course failure.

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

1. Academic course success.
2. Behavioral improvement.
3. Attendance improvement.
4. Subgroup performance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Academic Course Success
Rationale	<p>Student graduation possibilities are directly dependent on successful course completion. Student transitions to their home zoned schools are also impacted based on successful course completion while they are at our school.</p> <p>Teachers and staff will deliver standards-based, blended lessons with specially designed instruction that will increase the number of On-Track students by 15% in course success.</p> <p>Teachers and staff will deliver instructional aid to support students using online academic platforms to increase course completion and eligibility to transition back to home zoned schools on time by 60% of students.</p> <p>Student subgroup performance will improve.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>APEX and traditional resources (Blended Learning) will be used to deliver standards-based lessons.</p> <p>Reading conferencing, goal setting and practice will be used to continue to improve student literacy.</p> <p>Provide re-teaching an re-assessing for grade level academic expectations.</p> <p>Provide School-Wide Writing practice and feedback monthly.</p> <p>PLCs will monitor student progress and pace and intervene as needed.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>They are grade level, standards based, responsive to student need and individualized for each student.</p> <p>Students and staff can utilize live, realtime data to monitor progress, set goals and respond to needs.</p> <p>Because of the individualized nature, these resources will help address deficiencies within all subgroups of students.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide continued staff support for IRLA and Achieve 3000 Reading system. 2. Provide teaching strategies and specially designed instruction training for teachers. 3. Provide writing activities and scoring for feedback. 4. Provide PLCs direction through guiding questions and monitoring. 5. Provide students with recognition for progress and On-Track status.
Person Responsible	Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Behavior and Social/Emotional
Rationale	Student behavioral learning and emotional wellbeing are areas of need for our students. Student placement in our school is based on behavioral challenges and mental health need.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Teachers and staff will deliver daily social and emotional lessons in the classroom that will increase the number of On-Track students by 15% in behavior each quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers and staff will deliver daily social and emotional lessons in the classroom that will be focused on throughout the school day. Trauma Informed Training for staff will develop more understanding of students' social an emotional needs. Individual reflection and instruction via student point sheets and level system to modify behavior.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Brain based research shows that students with traumatic histories have difficulty learning and functioning without addressing coping and centering strategies. Our students also need direct instruction in proper social skill behavior as well as emotional regulation.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide staff with lessons and materials for daily social emotional instruction. 2. Provide staff with bi-weekly Trauma Informed Care Training. 3. Provide staff and students with updated level system for behavior modification. 4. Provide students with individual and small group counseling as needed. 5. Provide students with recognition for progress and On-Track status.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	If students are not in regular attendance they can not find as much success with academic and behavioral progress.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will decrease the amount of students that are Off-Track for attendance by 15% per quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom teachers will focus and review attendance data and goals with students. Classroom teachers will reach out and contact parents when students are absent. Our student services team will contact families and problem solve for students that show an increased need for support with attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Focusing on attendance at the classroom level, school level and then problem solving at the individual student level shows improvement for student attendance. Utilizing an MTSS Team approach will address students at various levels of performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with direction for attendance system and record keeping. 2. Provide MTSS Team with system and data recording to address chronic attendance issues. 3. Recognize students and staff responding positively to the attendance at least twice per quarter. 4. Create clubs that students enjoy to promote connection and attendance at school. 5.
Person Responsible	Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@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