

Pasco County Schools

Pasco High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pasco High School

36850 STATE ROAD 52, Dade City, FL 33525

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

Demographics

Principal: Kari Kadlub A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	66%
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: C (48%) 2018-19: I (%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pasco High School

36850 STATE ROAD 52, Dade City, FL 33525

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Pasco High is to create a collaborative environment that nurtures learning, mutual respect, and a strong work ethic, thereby helping to develop future citizens for the challenges that lie ahead.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to create a community which works together so all Pasco High students will reach their highest potential.

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
Kadlub, Kari	Principal	
Ellis, Phil	Assistant Principal	
Fernandez, Catalina	Assistant Principal	
Melvin, Aaron		
Bromley, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	
Glover, Marissa	Instructional Coach	
Crazy Horse Clark, Samson	Teacher, K-12	
Edwards, Mignon	Other	
Graham, Caroline	Instructional Coach	
Harbour, Rachel Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Jeter, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Jones, Ronald John	Teacher, K-12	
Jones, Sophia Marie	Teacher, K-12	
Kilmer, Amy	Instructional Coach	
Lennard, Robert	Teacher, ESE	
Nelson, William Keith	Teacher, K-12	
Purdy, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Resto, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Reynolds, James	Teacher, K-12	
Salazar, Irene	Teacher, K-12	
Swackard, Eshonda	Assistant Principal	
Virtue, Carrick	Teacher, K-12	
Webb, Alyse	Graduation Coach	
Wetherby, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/7/2022, Kari Kadlub A

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

86

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,653

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

15

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

14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	420	362	469	401	1652
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	67	65	57	257
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	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	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/8/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474	420	377	416	1687
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	40	26	34	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	41	30	32	170
Course failure in ELA	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	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	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	120	138	143	571
Course Failure ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	123	146	124	505

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	98	113	96	424

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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474	420	377	416	1687
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	40	26	34	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	41	30	32	170
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	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	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	120	138	143	571
Course Failure ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	123	146	124	505

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	98	113	96	424

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

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	39%	51%	51%					57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	38%							53%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	21%							41%	42%
Math Achievement	35%	35%	38%					56%	51%
Math Learning Gains	50%							49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%							42%	45%
Science Achievement	47%	50%	40%					70%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	49%	48%					73%	73%

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

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	56%	68%	-12%	67%	-11%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	63%	69%	-6%	70%	-7%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	31%	60%	-29%	61%	-30%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	58%	62%	-4%	57%	1%

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	7	14	10	9	41	58	9	30		82	11
ELL	3	19	16	19	46	36	20	42		79	20
ASN	55										
BLK	22	29	11	18	47	55	18	48		86	22
HSP	32	35	22	28	46	42	42	58		89	35
MUL	30	33		32	47		40			86	50
WHT	49	42	25	47	55	70	59	71		93	56
FRL	30	35	23	29	47	53	36	58		88	33
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	12	24	27	16	25	26	28	38		80	13
ELL	5	21	21	16	31	33	26			75	29
ASN	86	50									
BLK	25	32	19	28	25		59	50		91	29
HSP	33	32	25	32	32	29	52	76		86	40
MUL	39	25		36	40					62	
WHT	51	42	32	53	31	34	73	83		91	51
FRL	31	33	25	32	29	31	53	62		83	31
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	11	32	30	21	46	30	21	36		85	20
ELL	7	28	30	14	35	31	29	50		58	
BLK	29	40	33	33	50	41	37	50		83	32
HSP	42	51	41	39	54	46	47	62		84	35
MUL	58	63		47	54		58	50		100	31
WHT	59	49	37	54	57	46	72	73		88	54
FRL	38	47	39	37	51	48	49	60		84	35

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	34

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	30
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	55
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	45

Multiracial Students	
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	57
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Across all grade levels and core content areas, we find that many students are struggling to pass the Algebra 1 and ELA FSA.

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

After reviewing the students who need to retake algebra 1 and ELA FSA we found that 501 11th and 12th-grade students did not pass the ELA FSA and 460 did not pass the algebra 1 FSA.

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

High-impact instruction in the classroom as well as targeted remediation efforts for these students would address this trend.

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

In the previous school year, geometry EOC scores improved to beat the state average by 1%.

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

Focusing on the PLC planning process as well as providing effective instruction and remediation for students in need.

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

To accelerate learning teachers will be utilizing effective PLC planning and identifying focus benchmarks when working with their peers. Additionally, teachers will be using data from formative assessments on focus benchmarks

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.

Select staff attended a PLC institute over the summer in order to better learn how to run a functional PLC. Additionally, staff members will receive professional development opportunities regarding lesson planning, the PLC process, and standards based grading.

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

PLC facilitators and the school leadership team will be engaging in the professional development process together to build common ownership over the refined PLC process. Additionally, new teachers will be receiving additional support through new teacher meetings where these processes will be explained.

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 ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Pasco high school had 34% of students score at level 3 or above on the ELA 10th FSA in 2022

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, Pasco High School will improve student performance by 2% in English Language Arts as measured by local, district, and state indicators

Monitoring:

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

The ELA team will use FAST PM1 and PM2 to monitor the progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Resto (jresto@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Implementation of targeted intervention for students who scored below level 3 on the previous examination. The areas on the exam with the lowest score will be the priority.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students must receive remediation to make up for lost learning gains. Data was pulled from my students to determine student scores as well as subsection scores.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

At Pasco high school only 45% of students scored with a level 3 or higher on the Biology EOC.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, Pasco High School will improve student performance by 2% in Biology areas as measured by local, district, and state indicators.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will use PLC time to identify student progress through the district quarterly checks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Phil Ellis (pellis@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will be identified for intervention through performance on class assessments as well as quarterly checks. Students will receive in-class remediation as the data dictates.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This strategy was chosen due to the lack of state progress monitoring for biology, as well as the effective work that can be done through PLC.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

At Pasco high school 21% of students scored at level 3 or higher on the Algebra 1 EOC.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, Pasco High School will improve student performance by 2% in Mathematics as measured by local, district, and state indicators.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and instructional coaches will utilize data from NWEA assessments as well as in-class assessments to monitor student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eshonda Swackard (eswackar@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Based upon data from NWEA scores and in-class assessments students will receive targeted remediation. Additionally, students in remedial math courses will receive support from the mathematics coach on spiral reviews for FSA retakes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This strategy will leverage our classroom teachers as well as our support staff to deliver the support our students need.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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

In 2022 62% of students scored a 3 or higher on the US history EOC.

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, Pasco High School will improve student performance by 2% in Mathematics as measured by local, district, and state indicators.

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

Progress will be monitored through district quarterly checks and in-class performance measures.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eshonda Swackard (eswackar@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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

There will be an increased focus on in-class remediation throughout the school year so that students receive timely feedback on their work and targeted remediation

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

This strategy aligns with our schools' new focus on providing remediation and targeted interventions for students.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Through a restorative approach to discipline and increased supervision in the hallways, Pasco high school is focusing on increased interaction and communication with students in a positive manner. Additionally, there is now a robust PBIS system in place where students can receive rewards for engaging in positive behavior in the classroom and at school in general. Lastly, increased walkthroughs and communication with the instructional staff is building cohesiveness between roles at the school.

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

The stakeholders involved are students, teachers, support staff, community volunteers, PTSA, and administration. Each of these stakeholders is responsible for refocusing on clear communication with all other stakeholders about needed actions for improving school culture. School staff is sending more communication home through students as well as phone calls, social media, newsletters, and flyers