

Pasco County Schools

# Pasco County Correction Department



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide  
Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>R.A.I.S.E</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>14</b>

## Pasco County Correction Department

20101 CENTRAL BLVD, Land O Lakes, FL 34637

www.pasco.k12.fl.us

### Demographics

**Principal: Shelley Carrino**

Start Date for this Principal: 5/5/2024

<b>2021-22 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Function</b> (per accountability file)	
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>	2023-24: No Rating

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The EPEA family's mission is to motivate our students to discover their small successes every day.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our family at EPEA values, respects, and responds to students' individual needs with the purpose of developing positive character traits. Our quality and dedicated staff provide a positive, supportive, safe, and nurturing environment to instill responsibility and respect for self and others. Our students will learn problem solving and conflict resolutions skills while exploring career choices to become effective contributors to the community.

#### Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Students are incarcerated youth who are receiving K12 and GED education. The teachers provide instruction individually to meet the specific needs of the students. Support staff meet with the students quarterly to review their academic and post-secondary goals.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Carrino, Shelley	Principal	Oversees the operation of East Pasco, JDC, and SDC. Provides a safe learning environment.
Mitch, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Oversees the operation of East Pasco, JDC, and SDC. Provides a safe learning environment. Oversees testing of students at SDC.

#### Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

#### If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

N/A

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Pending, Shelley Carrino

#### Total number of students enrolled at the school.

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

2

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

2

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

2

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

0

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

0

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

### 2022-23

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 7/8/2022

**2021-22 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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	

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

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

**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	

**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		51%	51%					57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains								53%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								41%	42%
Math Achievement		35%	38%					56%	51%
Math Learning Gains								49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								42%	45%
Science Achievement		50%	40%					70%	68%
Social Studies Achievement		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
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	58%	-58%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				



BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
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					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

### 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
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
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

### ESSA Data Review

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

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

**Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?**

Prior administration did not submit a plan; therefore, no data to reflect on.

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

Prior administration did not submit a plan; therefore, no data to reflect on.

**What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?**

Prior administration did not submit a plan; therefore, no data to reflect on.

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

Prior administration did not submit a plan; therefore, no data to reflect on.

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

Prior administration did not submit a plan; therefore, no data to reflect on.

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

Prior administration did not submit a plan; therefore, no data to reflect on.

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. DJJ Components specifically relating to Grade Advancement****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Most students enrolled at SDC tend to be off-track and younger students who still have the opportunity to make changes in their lives to pursue post-secondary options. To do this, it is important that the students are passing their classes to meet promotion/graduation requirements.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

100% of the students will be on track (C's or higher) academically in the courses that they are enrolled in during their length of stay at SDC.

**Monitoring:**

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

SDC teacher will meet with students weekly.  
School counselor meets with students each semester to review academic standing.  
Progress will be monitored via APEX dashboard verifying students are progressing in their classes.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Mitch (jeawilli@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Small group instruction is provided for students.  
Student/teacher contact is ensured weekly and in person in addition to virtual when able or needed.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Due to the structure and protocols at SDC, teachers may be limited with contact to 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.

SDC teacher will meet with students weekly.  
School counselor meets with students each semester to review academic standing.  
Progress will be monitored via APEX dashboard verifying students are progressing in their classes.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Mitch (jeawilli@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

N/A due to low student enrollment numbers

**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**

N/A

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

N/A

**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)**

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**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.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**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?

N/A

**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?

N/A

**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**

N/A

## Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Other

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

Student surveys issued quarterly

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

Teachers will reach out to new student within 24 hours to begin establishing rapport and reviewing academic goals and plans.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Through the survey results quarterly, the team will see that rapport is established between teachers and 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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Survey will be provided quarterly to the students for review	Mitch, Jessica, jeawilli@pasco.k12.fl.us