Anclote Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Anclote Elementary School

3610 MADISON ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

https://aes.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Ellen Thomas

Start Date for this Principal: 4/16/2018

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)	82%
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 (44%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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

Anclote Elementary School

3610 MADISON ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

https://aes.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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

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

Anclote Sailors - Dream, Believe and Achieve.

Dream - With all of our minds
Believe - With all of our hearts
Achieve - With all our might

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will be proficient leaders, readers and mathematicians by 3rd grade and maintain or improve every year thereafter.

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
Thomas, Ellen	Principal	All instructional leadership functions of a school. Shaping a vision of academic success for all students. Creating a climate hospitable to education. Cultivating leadership in others. Managing people, data and processes.
Griffin, Kara	Assistant Principal	All instructional leadership functions of a school. Including Discipline, coaching, PLCs and assessment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 4/16/2018, Ellen Thomas

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

416

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

14

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

7

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	62	57	68	83	60	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	418
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	13	12	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	3	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	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	21	13	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	32	23	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	15	12	41	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Course Failures	1	0	2	3	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	1	4	6	8	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	2	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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 7/14/2022

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	0	0	0	
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 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	

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	

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	
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 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	

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	6	3	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		52
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	38%	52%	56%				46%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						57%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						60%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	38%	46%	50%				46%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	44%						60%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						44%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	50%	59%				41%	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	32%	60%	-28%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	59%	1%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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	36%	59%	-23%	62%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
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	18	50	67	28	35		6				
ELL	40	58		13	38		40				
BLK	26	21		26	40						
HSP	36	64		36	52		32				
MUL	21			43							
WHT	41	51	58	40	41	41	34				
FRL	30	49	66	36	43	48	24				

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	17	19		27	44		15				
ELL	14	15		32	31		15				
BLK	29			33							
HSP	29	11		35	30		14				
WHT	41	27		43	33		35				
FRL	31	17	8	34	26	23	17				
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	22	38	57	26	48	43	7				
ELL	32	56		32	43	45	30				
ASN	73			64							
BLK	31			13							
HSP	41	56	50	39	45	55	50				
MUL	70	90		80	80						
WHT	45	53	65	48	63	42	38				
FRL	41	57	62	42	56	42	34				

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
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	
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	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	32
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	44
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	40
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?

Sub groups in ELA and Math did not meet the threshold of 41% proficiency. Sub groups included are ELL, FRL, Black, Multi and SWD. ELA outperformed Math in all areas.

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

ELA and Math proficiency demonstrate the highest need for improvement. Learning gains, while not optimum out performed proficiency levels by 20+ percent on average.

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

Lack of consistent teaching staff and inexperienced or guest teachers in classrooms without the pedagogy and experience to improve learning outcomes. Strong instructional coaching and learning, with academic goal setting and engagement for students will address this need for improvement.

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

Learning gains across the board showed dramatic improvement. The lowest quartile also performed well.

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

We began to focus on interventions towards the end of last year. For the beginning part of the year, it was whole groups needing instructions. Towards the last third of the year, the students needing additional assistance needs were met with intervention and additional school time.

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

We are meeting weekly with PLCs to ensure we are reaching the level of Rigor outlined in the best standards. Coaches and Admin are observing in classrooms to ensure engagement strategies and lesson content is appropriate.

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.

During ERD, we will provide teachers with goal setting strategies and tracking strategies for students as well as model and practice Kagan engagement and accountability practices.

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

We will continue to grow our Leader in Me program with academics and improve teacher pedagogy through skill based PD and practice time.

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

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Family Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Family involvement has been very low over the past few years, especially with the onset of COVID practices. We would like to get more families and community members involved in the school community at large. With involvement comes higher achievement levels.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The school will track events, curriculum nights, SAC membership and community involvement numbers for each area. We are hoping to raise participation in these areas by 25% this coming year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Sign in sheets, Tracking of communication and messaging.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will be utilizing Leader in Me to engage students, teachers, families and the community in our school culture of building leaders. We will also begin an All Pro Dads Chapter at our school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	We have participated in Leader in Me for the last 4 years in-school. We are looking to expand to welcome in families and Community members into our fold.

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.

Students will participate in Leader in Me lessons daily to increase their connectedness with each other and the school.

ClassDojo will be utilized as a communication tool schoolwide to highlight student work and leadership achievement to parents.

The 7 Habits learning will deepen in a systematic fashion designed by the Lighthouse Team.

Staff will be trained in the next phase of LiM academic Notebooks.

Parent Workshops will be led digitally/in person to work through the Seven Habits of Highly Effective Families.

All Pro Dads Chapter will be initiated at AES.

Person Responsible	Kara Griffin (kgriffin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Proficiency Levels are low among all subgroups and in all subject areas. By increasing the engagement and level of rigor attached to the BEST standards we believe we will see an increase in proficiency levels throughout the school.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We believe we will see an across the board(all subject areas) increase in proficiency through the utilization of engaging strategies and Rigorous practices that meet the level of the BEST standards.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor through our Module, and Unit assessments in Reading, Math and Science. PLC's will analyze data to see where the gaps are and create plans to respond. In addition, for grades K-5, FAST data will be utilized to measure growth in each area.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will utilize Kagan Strategies, Leader in Me Academic 2 Strategies and AVID strategies to raise the level of engagement of our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The 3 strategies are all research based and training will be or already has been delivered to Staff.

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Data shows that 5 of our subgroups are not meeting the 40% minimum proficiency levels in Math and reading.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We intend to raise all our subgroups to over the 40% minimum proficiency in the 22-23 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will be monitoring Tier One data in PLC's and making instructional decisions to improve sub-group performance through a systematic response in Tier two and Tier 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will follow the PLC guiding principals to analyze and respond to data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	PLC's have been embedded in our culture for many years. However, we will be boosting the levels of systematic response in all Tiers of support for students in a systematic way that has not been approached previously.

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.

Teams will analyze Tier one proficiency and reflect on their practices to improve their instruction.
Providing effectively targeted interventions in a timely fashion students achievement data will improve.
All instructional personnel will be provided training on intervention practices for tier 2 and tier 3
Systematic response will be provided to all students - Sub groups will be viewed separately to ensure performance is where intended.
needing T2 and/or T3 interventions.
• Students will be identified for Tier 2 supports by essential
standards, assessment data, and learning targets.
• All subgroups data will be collected and remain a focus of
the school
• All means All – Each and every one

Person Responsible	Kara Griffin (kgriffin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Teams will analyze Tier one proficiency and reflect on their practices to improve their instruction.
Providing effectively targeted interventions in a timely fashion students achievement data will improve.
All instructional personnel will be provided training on intervention practices for tier 2 and tier 3
Systematic response will be provided to all students - Sub groups will be viewed separately to ensure performance is where intended.
needing T2 and/or T3 interventions.
• Students will be identified for Tier 2 supports by essential

standards, assessment data, and learning targets.
• All subgroups data will be collected and remain a focus of
the school
• All means All – Each and every one

Person Responsible   Kara Griffin (kgriffin@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

Grades K-2 will focus on phonics and phonemic awareness to assist struggling students to increase their potential for on grade- level reading. Our DIBELS data indicated there are 63% of K, 34% of 1st, and 36% of 2nd graders needing intensive supports in reading. In order to ensure students can read at grade level they must be confident in their foundational skills. DIBELS will be utilized to progress monitor T3 students monthly to note progress and deficiencies in reading. Students not showing progress will be brought to the School Intervention Team to determine a plan for addressing needs and removing barriers for their leaning.

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

On our statewide assessments for the 21-22 schoolyear, 64% of 3rd grade, 45% of 4th grade and 72% of 5th grade students did not score a level 3 or above. Grades 3-5 will focus on Reading Comprehension as identified as a need in DIBELS assessment of MAZE as well as the FSA in 21-22. In addition, Oral Reading Fluency will be practiced and measured monthly as a component of a well balanced reading program for 4/5. In 3rd grade we will continue to intervene with foundational skills through SIPPS and DIBELS lessons for our students needing skills to assist them in reading at grade level.

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)

80 % of students will meet or exceed grade level standards by the end of the 22-23 school year. Student data will be progress monitored monthly using DIBELS assessments. In addition, growth will be measured utilizing the FAST assessment data 2 additional times this school year. Lexia will be utilized as an intervention tool to help grow students levels in reading.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

75% of students will meet or exceed grade level standards by the end of the 22-23 school year as measured by the FAST assessment, SIPPS and DIBELS data. In addition, subgroups will also be monitored to measure growth.

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.

DIBELS data will be measured 3x per year as the main indicator for growth in foundational skills. In addition, MTSS PLC will meet to discuss results of students in intensive intervention utilizing the SIPPS program. All staff that support students in reading will be discussing intervention progress in PLC weekly. T2 groups will be fluid based on need. T3 students will need to be on grade level prior to being released from the group.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Thomas, Ellen, ethomas@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. §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?

Evidence based practices include SIPPS, DIBELS and Heggerty.
According to WWC Practice Guide, there is strong evidence to support providing intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening.
SIPPS- The SIPPS program provides a structured literacy approach to foundational skills instruction through explicit instructional routines focused on phonological awareness, spelling-sounds, and sight words, with immediate application to reading connected text and to spelling. Students using the SIPPS program showed significantly greater gains in decoding on a normed assessment test. These findings clearly show that SIPPS is an effective program for teaching all students to decode and indicate that it is particularly effective for English language learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. SIPPS has shown the largest gains in reading ability for students who typically have the most difficulty.

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?

Lexia Core 5- https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/reading/lexiar-core5r-reading-programstruggling-readers
The impact of Core5 was examined in a cluster-randomized study of five schools in the greater Chicago metropolitan area. The study focused on 116 students in grades K-5 receiving special education support for reading difficulties. Students received "push-in" and/or "pull-out" support from a special education teacher. After 1 year, students who used Core5 had significantly higher MAP scores compared to a control group (ES = +0.23), qualifying it for an ESSA "Strong" rating.
According to WWC Practice Guides, there is strong evidence that supports explicit instruction to develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Heggerty also meets Hattie's Strategy #48, Direct Instruction (effect size .60).

Lexia will address the needs of all levels of instruction in reading. The small group/individual teacher conferences/instruction to fill in for gaps of learning will

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
An intervention schedule will be built and monitored to ensure that all students needing T3 interventions are supported. Admin will build and adjust schedules to ensure that all grades have the support personnel needed to meet the needs of the children. Coaches will provide support on SIPPS, DIBELS and Lexia CORE procedures, processes and reporting to ensure interventionists understand how to use the data they receive from the interventions. PD will be provided by Coaches and District for anyone needing more attention in a given program. Students will be assessed at least monthly using the given tools and reported to the School Intervention Team, every 6 weeks.	Thomas, Ellen, ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us
Intervention Teams will meet in a PLC once per month to discuss students not making expected growth. They will problem solve with the SIT and determine additional methods to assist struggling learners. Admin will calendar the meetings each month. The SIT team will update records and assist with problem solving. If there is additional learning needing by the Intervention team, Literacy Coach will investigate and provide needed support.	Thomas, Ellen, ethomas@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.

We are a Leader in Me school that focuses on building Leaders of both staff and students. With this we follow the Seven Habits of effective people, teens, children. We consistently recognize students and staff for their efforts, growth and excellence. We are a community of learners that are not treated with punitive measures, but are recognized as learners and learning is a constant process.

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

All stakeholders, parents, students and staff have a responsibility to be respectful and civilized in their work with each other. We all learn to respect each others roles in the lives of children and help to make each other better.