Achieve Center Of Pasco

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 9/8/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 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
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

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
Mitch, Jessica	School Counselor	Transition Specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 9/8/2020, Paul Lipinski

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

12

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 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
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](#).	

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	5	2	15	3	7	8	5	45
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	15	3	7	8	5	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	1	3	5	6	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	5	4	4	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	5	6	5	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	1	5	3	4	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	2	4	0	0	17

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	5	2	14	2	6	8	8	45

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	4	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	
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

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	
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

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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%
	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%
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

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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
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

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
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%	2
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%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	4
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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%	2

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.

8th Graders made up the majority of course failures and Level 1 performance in ELA and Math.

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

Decline data is hard to determine as the previous year student number of test scores were too low to have a report of proficiency. Last year there were increases in Math, Civics and ELA proficiency.

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.

8th Grade ELA had the greatest gap in achievement.

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

Civics, ELA and Math had proficiency scores increase. We improved our percent of students tested so now we have reportable data. We focused on Reading and Math intervention and supplemental supports like ALEKS and Achieve 3000.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

8th grade data for Math and ELA have the most student course failures. There are larger numbers of 8th graders as several are retained for not yet meeting promotion requirements.

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

1. Math Intervention
2. ELA- Reading
3. Writing Intervention
4. Social Emotional Supports
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students need additional instruction and intervention in math, especially the 8th grade population. Course success and FSA proficiency can be improved.
Measurable Outcome:	Staff will utilize the Online Academic Platform (APEX), Early Warning System and Level System Data to identify and problem solve students not making progress. Aleks and Zern can be used for tiered interventions that match individual needs. This will result in a 15% increase of students On-Track in Academics and Behavior for all students including the three targeted subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted math interventions will support students at their readiness level and fill the gap in skills and content knowledge.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The ALEKS and Zern programs align with our math curriculum, they are individualized to each student and have proven to increase achievement when used frequently.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student emotional health and resiliency are key components to life skills. Our students need supports that help them cope, grow and problem solve. This is evidenced by suspensions as well as emotional reactions observed daily and in our discipline data.
Measurable Outcome:	This will result in a 15% increase of students On-Track in Behavior/Discipline for all students including the three targeted subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	CASEL's Social Emotional Learning is the core of our curriculum. We will be using the 7Mindsets program to deliver engaging and relevant lessons to our students so they can goal set and show progress in the social emotional domains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	7Mindsets is rooted in CASEL's Social Emotional research and is progress in taxonomy as students rise in grade levels. It can support students for several years in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

For additional areas of student support our Leadership Team will utilize PBIS for behavior concerns and our student discussion protocol developed with SEDNET to problem solve academic and behavior needs for all students including the three targeted subgroups.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our focus this year is the Growth Mindset. We are using a book study that centers on the teachers being role models and coaches for our students. As a whole school students and staff will participate in growth mindset activities and reflections. Parents are welcomed to be involved and are informed of progress within the school goals.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.