

Pasco County Schools

Fox Hollow Elementary School



2022-23 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fox Hollow Elementary School

8309 FOX HOLLOW DR, Port Richey, FL 34668

<https://fhес.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Pitkoff

Start Date for this Principal: 11/15/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2021-22 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	2021-22: F (30%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	CSI

* 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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fox Hollow Elementary School

8309 FOX HOLLOW DR, Port Richey, FL 34668

<https://fh.es.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">90%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">49%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	F	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.

Fox Hollow Elementary seeks to:

Create a culture of trust and engagement.

Empower students to lead their own lives, and make a difference with others.

Provide students tools to better achieve goals.

Develop student voice.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fox Hollow Elementary in partnership with parents and the community will empower students to lead their own learning, discover their genius and make a positive impact on the world.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pitkoff, Jessica	Principal	Coaching/ Feedback Leader in Me Intermediate Evaluations SLT Walkthroughs Maintenance PLC's K-5 Data Meetings New Teachers Buses SAC Budget
Iarussi, Trisha	Assistant Principal	Coaching/ Feedback Assessments ESY Drills ELL/ESE SIT MTSS Primary Evaluations PLC's K-5 Scheduling Walkthroughs Cars PTO Data Meetings
Shipe, Sherri	Teacher, K-12	PLC Facilitator, Guiding Coalition team member, kindergarten teacher
Reardon, Theresa	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach- ELA, building capacity in the area of ELA, MTSS, and assisting with monitoring effectiveness of such.
Jett, Maureen	Teacher, K-12	PLC Facilitator for special areas- Assists in implementation of Leader in Me, PBIS, and various aspects of a positive culture.
Cochran, Harold	School Counselor	Guiding Coalition member, PBIS and Mental Health supports- will assist in monitoring effectiveness of tiers 1, 2 and tier 3 behavior supports.
Manuel, Joan	Teacher, ESE	Guiding Coalition member- will assist in monitoring data of students with disabilities.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Steele, Shale	Teacher, ESE	Guiding Coalition member- will assist in implementing and monitoring student academic and behavioral data to determine effectiveness of interventions. Will also support our Student Services Team to ensure all students are receiving appropriate supports in order to access grade level standards.
Baker, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade PLC Facilitator, Guiding Coalition member- assists with implementation of Leader in Me, academic tiers of supports, and supports for new teachers and staff.
Combast, Ida	Teacher, K-12	4th grade PLC Facilitator, Guiding Coalition member- assists with implementation of Leader in Me, academic tiers of supports, and supports for new teachers and staff.
Skinner, Jeri Lynn	Instructional Coach	Math coach- Guiding Coalition Member, supporting Science and Math instruction within core and interventions, PBIS, Leader in Me, etc.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 11/15/2022, Jessica Pitkoff

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

750

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

25

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

21

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	123	106	93	111	84	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	633
Attendance below 90 percent	12	21	31	22	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	94	20	35	16	37	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	52	38	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	80	44	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA/MATH	1	4	9	17	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	17	29	24	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/8/2022

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	96	100	81	95	120	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	26	38	19	35	41	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	6	10	6	17	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course Failures ELA or Math	6	10	23	9	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1s on 2019 ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	24	34	20	24	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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

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	96	100	81	95	120	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	26	38	19	35	41	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	6	10	6	17	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course Failures ELA or Math	6	10	23	9	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1s on 2019 ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	24	34	20	24	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	24%	52%	56%				44%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						42%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						48%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	21%	46%	50%				41%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	36%						54%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						38%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	17%	50%	59%				47%	53%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	59%	-14%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	35%	55%	-20%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	37%	59%	-22%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	62%	-18%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	57%	-23%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	36	36	15	33	15	6				
ELL	13	39	50	18	30	25	7				
BLK	10	36		10	43						
HSP	27	36	40	21	34	31	10				
MUL	24	29		9	29						
WHT	25	43	54	25	38	32	19				
FRL	23	37	44	20	35	31	17				
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	5	8		9	7		8				
ELL	17			9							
BLK	14			10							
HSP	20	22		13	11		11				
MUL	22			22							
WHT	30	24		27	36		28				
FRL	25	33	46	21	28	9	21				
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	21	35	36	23	45	38	31				
ELL											
BLK	17	10		27							
HSP	43	43		32	54	38	32				
MUL	23			45							
WHT	48	49	71	45	53	31	55				
FRL	41	40	47	38	53	42	42				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	277
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	23
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	34
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based upon 21-22 FSA data, students in the subgroups of Black/African American, ELL, Multiracial, and Students with Disabilities did not score above 41% growth.

4th Math increased 11% from 22% proficient to 33% proficient.

In grades 3rd and 5th, ELA, Math, and Science demonstrate a need for improvement. 4th ELA continues to demonstrate improvement needs as well.

When considering learning gains overall, ELA gains were slightly higher with 39% growth and our lower quartile in ELA of 46% demonstrating growth.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based upon 21-22 FSA data, 3rd and 5th math, as well as 5th science, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement due to being 17% proficient or less.

ELA also continues to demonstrate need for improvement, however, scores in math are significantly lower.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Teacher/staff turnover greatly contributed to inconsistencies within the school culture, best practices for instruction, and behavior. Additionally, turnover may have also contributed to the lack of student attendance. A lack of explicit instruction aligned to the standards also contributed to the need for improvement.

Instruction:

During PLCs, teachers will plan explicit instruction aligned to the standards/benchmarks and plan/monitor interventions, as supported by Admin and Coaches.

Culture:

During the 22-23 school year, we will be implementing Leader in Me schoolwide. We will also hold an emphasis on building the school culture to positively impact student achievement, staff and student attendance, parent involvement, and staff/student engagement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

4th Math demonstrated an 11% increase in proficiency from the 20-21 school year.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

3 new teachers were hired for 4th grade with strengths in math.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

- * Coaching cycles
- * Walk-throughs
- * Data monitoring/analysis
- * PLCs
- * Interventions

Admin and instructional coaches will work to build capacity in instructional best practices to increase student engagement and achievement. Additionally, data monitoring and analysis will occur frequently and pervasively to determine student needs academically and behaviorally. Quality interventions will be implemented and monitored. PLCs will intentionally plan instruction, while utilizing the four guiding principles, to ensure that there are opportunities for all subgroups of students to engage in grade appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement and for all student to be held to high expectations.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Kagan
Leader in Me
PLC at Work Institute
BSI Conference

MTSS
IPG Tool

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

PBIS Rewards
Guiding Coalition
New Teacher/Staff development

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

A lack of systems was present during the 21-22 school year as demonstrated by the infrequent collecting, monitoring and analyzing of data, both academically and behaviorally.

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

By the end of the 2023 school year, students will increase overall proficiency as measured by the FAST assessments.

By the end of the 2023 school year, 75% of teachers will use the PLC guiding questions to plan for instruction, analyze data and monitor for impact.

By the end of the 2023 school year, teachers needing tier 2 and tier 3 support will decrease to 10%.

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

F.A.S.T. assessment data will increase as a result of PLCs implementing the Teaching-Assessing cycle. CFAs, DIBELS, Lexia, Zearn, SIPP, etc, will be areas of data collection that will be analyzed during PLCs to determine effectiveness of core instruction and interventions.

Teams will implement interventions using agreed upon/vetted resources as well as entering data points into the intervention tracking spreadsheet on a regular basis. Data analysis will occur during PLCs to determine intervention impact.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Updated - PLCs will meet weekly utilizing the 4 guiding questions. During this process, teacher practices and student achievement will be monitored for impact.

PLCs will meet weekly using the 4 guiding questions and work collaboratively to collect and analyze data in order to monitor the impact of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research demonstrates schools that have strong, functioning PLCs increase student proficiency, therefore, closing learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

On-going professional development and support will be provided to teachers around developing and sustaining functioning PLCs.

Person Responsible Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Content coach will facilitate benchmark aligned planning.

Person Responsible Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Coaching support will be provided based upon walk-through data, assessment data, and teacher request.

Person Responsible Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Content coach will facilitate benchmark aligned planning.

Person Responsible Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Coaching support will be provided based upon walk-through data.

Person Responsible Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Collaborative Culture

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: By implementing Leader in Me, we will build leadership among our students, staff, and families. Our Early Release day plan is to build capacity of the implementation of Leader in Me within classrooms. As a result, we will build and sustain a collaborative culture for all stakeholders. Staff turn-over and student discipline were significant during the 21-22 school year which greatly impacted student and staff engagement.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. By the end of the 2023 school year, the Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment will increase each survey period. (Baseline to be determined in 09/22)

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Student and staff attendance will be monitored monthly. Staff and student engagement results will increase as demonstrated by the Gallup and MRA surveys. Frequent walk-throughs with specific look-fors will occur. PBIS Rewards will assist in monitoring engagement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. All stakeholders will model and provide direct instruction of the 7 Habits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. Positive relationships help build connectedness amongst all stakeholders. Staff and students will feel a sense of belonging, purpose, and hope which will result in increased engagement and involvement.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

On-going professional development- Early Release Day PD will include Leader in Me development. Quality of implementation of Leader in Me will be measured by the predetermined Look-fors. Incentive plan will be implemented (PBIS, Leaders of the Month, Lexia/Zearn)

Person Responsible Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

On-going mentoring and coaching from an individual that is experienced with school turnaround efforts will prove to be greatly beneficial. With the support of our Principal Mentor, needed change and necessary supports will be identified, implemented, and monitored.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall school grade will increase from an F to a C by the end of the 2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Admin and the Principal Mentor will collaborate frequently to review progress and effectiveness of action plan goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

On-going coaching and feedback will be provided to the administrative team throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The school Principal is a new leader and could benefit from on-going support related to the turnaround process.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

On-going coaching support as necessary with at least monthly check-ins will occur. Supports will be aligned with School Success Plan goals.

Person Responsible

Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We will be focusing on MTSS, specifically tier 1 instruction to match the rigor of the standards. Professional development and on-going monitoring of all subgroups will occur within PLCs to ensure that all teachers understand the MTSS process and implement the process with fidelity. In addition, tiers 2 and 3 will be highly monitored for effectiveness, both academically and behaviorally.

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

We will be focusing on MTSS, specifically tier 1 instruction to match the rigor of the standards. Professional development and on-going monitoring of all subgroups, including L25%, will occur within PLCs to ensure that all teachers understand the MTSS process and implement the process with fidelity. In addition, tiers 2 and 3 will be highly monitored for effectiveness, both academically and behaviorally.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

F.A.S.T will show growth from Fall to Spring. DIBELS, SIPPS, CFAs, will also be monitored throughout the year to determine effectiveness of instruction during core and interventions. Students amongst all subgroups will show an increase in student proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

F.A.S.T will show growth from Fall to Spring with student proficiency as well as student gains from each testing period to the next.

DIBELS, SIPPS, CFAs, will also be monitored throughout the year to determine effectiveness of instruction during core and interventions. Students amongst all subgroups will show an increase in student proficiency.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monitoring tools will include F.A.S.T, DIBLES, Lexia, CFAs, and module assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Pitkoff, Jessica, jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

HMH, Lexia, SIPPS

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

District vetted programs and curriculum include HMH, Lexia, and SIPPS.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

Coaching, assessment and PD will be on-going throughout the year.	Pitkoff, Jessica, jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us
---	--

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Professional development and on-going Implementation of Leader in Me and PBIS practices will occur across all stakeholders.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Guiding Coalition- provide support and development to build capacity amongst staff in the areas of Leader in Me and PBIS.
 Admin- modeling, monitoring, and supporting expectations.
 Teachers/staff-modeling, monitoring and supporting Leader in Me and PBIS for students and families.
 Students- applying practices in relationship to Leader in Me and PBIS at both home and school.
 Families- supporting the school in development of these practices.