

Pasco County Schools

Bayonet Point Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

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: 8/4/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

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 (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jacobsen, Michelle	Instructional Coach	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/Instructional_Learning_Design_Coach_06.02.15.pdf
Carrino, Shelley	Principal	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/admin/Prin_Middle.pdf
Wild, Kathy	Assistant Principal	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/admin/Ast_Prin_Middle.pdf
Cline, Lori	Teacher, K-12	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf
Wiest, Bret	Teacher, K-12	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/graduation_enhancement_teacher.pdf
Thompson, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/graduation_enhancement_teacher.pdf
Newton, James	Teacher, K-12	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf
Peterson, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf
Barrow, Lyndsay	Teacher, K-12	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/instructional/Teacher%20of%20Basic%20Education%20Academic%20Program.pdf
Caruso, Melissa	Assistant Principal	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/job_descriptions/admin/Ast_Prin_Middle.pdf
Mulvey, Laura	Instructional Coach	http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/Instructional_Learning_Design_Coach_06.02.15.pdf
Spaziani, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	
Abouelenin, Dalia	Teacher, K-12	
Collins, Rowenna	Teacher, K-12	
Patrick, Marissa	Teacher, K-12	
Montgomery, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Schrader, Charity	Teacher, K-12	
Hallberg, Jaclyn	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/4/2014, Cindy Jack

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.*

2

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (41%)

	2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	274	265	246	0	0	0	0	785	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	30	38	0	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	98	75	0	0	0	0	271	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	15	39	0	0	0	0	83	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	32	34	0	0	0	0	75	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	50	54	0	0	0	0	159	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	72	61	0	0	0	0	200	

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	64	72	0	0	0	0	192	

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	13	0	0	0	0	13	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/6/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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	
	(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	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%

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

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
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
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%	1
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%	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	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	1
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%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 few years. Even though this department had the lowest achievement data, it was one of the largest improvements over previous years. Our science proficiency scores in 2018 to 2019 increased from 32% and 41%, respectively. Due to the COVID pandemic, we do not have statewide assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year; but, we do have quarterly data that we have analyzed. Our science quarterly data has definite strength in 6th and 8th grade. Our 6th graders in both Advanced and Regular Science kept pace with or exceeded the district average on most, if not all standards tested each quarter. Some of our 8th graders kept pace with or exceeded the district average on most, if not all standards, despite having staff turnover in that particular grade level during the second semester. The lower scores are in classes with newer staff members who are relatively new to BPMS, as well our class with a mid-year turnover. Our veteran 8th grade Science teacher's student quarterly scores consistently exceed the district average each quarter for all standards.

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 student performance. Due to the COVID pandemic, we do not have statewide assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year; but, we do have quarterly data that we have analyzed. Our 6th grade cohort has consistently exceeded the district's average on most, if not all standards. On those standards that they did not exceed the district average, our 6th graders were only slightly below the district average. Our 7th graders exceeded the district's average on some standards; their performance from quarter to quarter is inconsistent. Our 8th graders did not exceed the district average in any quarter; this may be attributed to administration not being able to hire a certified math teacher at the beginning of the year to fill a last minute vacancy created by a staff departure right before the beginning of the 2019-2020 school year.

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 when compared to state averages, with a 20 point difference. We have had almost 100% turnover in this department within the last few years. Over the past few years, the teachers holding these positions have only had one or two years teaching experience. We are confident that our performance will improve as we hire and retain high quality and experienced teachers. Due to the COVID pandemic, we do not have statewide assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year; but, we do have quarterly data that we have analyzed. Our quarterly data is inconsistent in comparison to the district average. Quarter 2 was our strongest quarterly results for all three grade levels. The inconsistency may be due to newer staff members who were hired in addition to staff designated to teach split grade levels/subjects.

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 dedicated teachers spent a significant amount of time identifying essential standards, administering common formative

assessments (comprehension checks and quarterlies), and then delivering targeted interventions to struggling students. Second, our work with TNTP 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. Due to the COVID pandemic, we do not have statewide assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year; but, we do have quarterly data that we have analyzed. Our ELA teachers continued to utilize targeted interventions to struggling students after administering and analyzing common formative assessments. They also continued to teach students strategies to pull information from texts as well as building arguments based on evidence.

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

One of the biggest areas for concern for our school involve our three student subgroups (Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Black/African American) which did not meet the ESSA federal index of 41%. Our Students with Disabilities and Black/African American students did not meet the federal index for a second consecutive year. Due to the COVID pandemic, we do not have statewide assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

1. Staff will ensure instructional alignment to the rigor of the standards taught (Success Plan Goal 1-High Impact Instruction).
2. Staff will design differentiated learning experiences that directly align with the shifts measured in the Instructional Practice Guide (Success Plan Goal 1-High Impact Instruction).
3. Staff will create a positive school culture that supports students with achieving efficacy (Success Plan Goal 2-Collaborative Culture).
4. Staff will successfully complete assessment-intervention cycles for essential standards (Success Plan Goal 3-Data Driven Decisions).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Students who are on track in all classes will be engaged in learning activities.

Measurable Outcome: Each month, 100% of classrooms will show evidence of rigorous, standards-aligned instruction indicated by Core Actions 1, 2, and 3 on the Instructional Practice Guide.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will anticipate student needs and design differentiated learning experiences and Tier 2 interventions aligned to the rigor of the standards. Teachers will provide differentiated learning opportunities and Tier II instruction 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Attention to the rigor of the standard will ensure that learning opportunities are at the appropriate level for each subject and grade (<https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/>). Our problem-based learning approach (Authentic Learning Units) will ensure that students are engaged (Ongoing professional development with IDE coaches). The work with the IPG (Instructional Practice Guide) will ensure that teachers are utilizing best practices as they engage students (<https://achievethecore.org/page/2730/aligned-instructional-practice>).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will implement Tier I and Tier II instruction utilizing collaborative teaching and LATIC structures.

Person Responsible: Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

2. Teams will identify students with will and/or skill opportunities and action plan for their success.

Person Responsible: Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

3. Teachers will engage in monthly walkthroughs and reflective practices utilizing the IPG (Instructional Practice Guide) to monitor rigor.

Person Responsible: Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

4. STEM & Design Process will be integrated school-wide, with students having time each week to engage in solving real world problems and STEM related Authentic Learning Units.

Person Responsible: Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus	Disengaged students are not academically successful. By utilizing PBIS and Social Emotional Learning strategies and lessons, we will increase student and staff engagement to focus on developing more positive classroom culture that supports student efficacy.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of each month, 80% of students will rate themselves as 8 or higher on the TNTP Student Engagement Survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our staff has been trained in Trauma Informed Care and Social Emotional Learning strategies as well as verbal & nonverbal de-escalation strategies. Additionally, our Behavior Specialists have worked with some staff members to provide both verbal and non-verbal de-escalation strategies to use with students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence shows that a Trauma Informed approach using Social Emotional Learning standards 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. To ensure more consistency among our schools in our feeder pattern, we will also begin to implement Conscious Discipline practices.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will create a positive culture that supports Executive Functioning, UDL, SEL, and High Levels of Learning to support students with achieving efficacy.

Person Responsible Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

2. Teachers will implement PBIS/Conscious Discipline with fidelity.

Person Responsible Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

3. Teachers will design their classrooms using the SEL standards as a foundation.

Person Responsible Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

4. BPMS will utilize Student Government to gather input/feedback from their peers to support and increase student engagement in and out of the classroom.

Person Responsible Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students who are academically engaged in classes and provided appropriate interventions will be more successful.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of each quarter, 90% of students will achieve the Tier I criteria for success on Common Formative Assessments (CFAs) after Tier II interventions have been implemented.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that timely, targeted interventions correlate stronger to 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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will analyze formative and summative assessments to ensure students are progressing towards mastery of the standards taught (Tier I).

Person Responsible Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

2. Teachers will implement Tier II interventions for students not reaching CFA criteria for success and utilize the Response to Intervention Trackers to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible Shelley Carrino (scarrino@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

As a school, we address building a positive school culture in a variety of ways. Our Leadership Team acts as liaisons to the rest of the faculty and staff to help disseminate information to staff members. We have Staff and Student Engagement committees that work together to plan school wide activities that encourage school spirit and positivity in all stakeholders. These committees plan and implement dress up days, team building activities, and holiday festivities for staff and students. We have extracurricular activities such as dances and field trips that students can participate in. Additionally, students can participate in one of our many athletic sports offered throughout the year if they meet eligibility requirements. Staff and students take the Gallup Survey, which assesses different aspects of school culture. Staff, students, and parents are invited to join our School Advisory Committee, which meets throughout the year to discuss school culture, happenings, and improvement plans as well as share events and happenings occurring at the school. We host quarterly Parent Teacher Conference Nights for parents who need or prefer to have conferences outside of school hours to ensure their student's success. Our school has a Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports Team (PBIS). This team is responsible for analyzing school wide discipline data and devising a plan to improve student behavior based upon the data. They are also responsible for training staff to use our school wide PBIS system in and out of the classroom, as well as running the school store that students can use to purchase items with their PBIS points. We utilize a Check-In Check-Out system for some of our most at-risk students (based upon school data) so that when they arrive at school they are greeted by familiar staff members who work with them to ensure they are ready to begin the day with a positive mindset and are ready to learn. This helps keep them focused on being productive and engaged in their academics instead of worrying about non-school related issues. The school's Trauma Informed Care committee attends district training that they bring back to school to share with the staff. This team is also responsible for helping our low income students have the items they need to be successful in school. These items include school supplies, hygiene products, clothes, and food to take home over the weekend so that they have food accessible to them. These students also receive meals and gifts during the holidays. Both the PBIS and TIC committees work with businesses within the community to get donations and support for our students.

Our collaborative school structures also promote a positive school culture. Our weekly PLCs give staff the opportunity to work together to create common formative assessments and analyze student achievement data. PLC's then use this data to provide interventions in the classroom. Monthly staff meetings are utilized to provide common professional development as well as celebrate school successes.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00