Schrader Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Schrader Elementary School

11041 LITTLE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

Demographics

Principal: Lee Anne Keith

Start Date for this Principal: 10/18/2015

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)	84%
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: C (43%)
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

Schrader Elementary School

11041 LITTLE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://ses.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	84%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

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.

Schrader Elementary: A compassionate culture with high expectations and unlimited possibilities for all. Every Raider, Every Day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

All of our students achieving success in college, career, and life.

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
Keith, Lee Anne	Principal	Assessments, Scheduling, PMP Process, 504s, Behavior, Primary staff evaluations, Coaching cycle with teachers, PLC planning with selected grade levels, member of Teacher and School Based intervention Teams, Staffings, Safety and Security, Hiring, Classroom observations, Data Analysis, Budget, Parent partnerships, community outreach
Middleton, Jill	Assistant Principal	Assessments, Scheduling, PMP Process, 504s, Behavior, Primary staff evaluations, Coaching cycle with teachers, PLC planning with selected grade levels, member of Teacher and School Based intervention Teams, Staffings, Safety and Security, Hiring, Classroom observations, Data Analysis,
Mularz, Shana	Instructional Coach	Oversees MTSS, PLCs, Planning, Data Collection, PMP process, Coaching Instructional teachers
Peterson, Sara	Instructional Coach	Oversees MTSS, PLCs, Planning, Data Collection, PMP process, Coaching Instructional teachers
Lines, Mariana	Teacher, ESE	ESE Chair, compliance, IEP, data collection, PreK and 5th Articulation for ESE students
Donley, Kristina	Behavior Specialist	Provides Tier 1 coaching to teachers, Tier 2 behavioral supports, CICO, Social Skills groups, Tier 3 BIP/FBA
Alderman, Christa	Teacher, K-12	Leader of grade 4, leads PLCs, Data Analysis, MTSS Schedules, team field trips, planning for success
Hopper, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Leader of grade K, leads PLCs, Data Analysis, MTSS Schedules, team field trips, planning for success
Tassone, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Leader of grade 3, leads PLCs, Data Analysis, MTSS Schedules, team field trips, planning for success

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 10/18/2015, Lee Anne Keith

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

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

600

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

6

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

6

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	121	90	107	108	75	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	601
Attendance below 90 percent	59	44	47	44	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	258
One or more suspensions	8	9	4	17	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	38	29	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	46	32	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	39	24	31	38	29	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184

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	4	17	11	15	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/26/2022

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	116	87	100	101	71	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	14	26	24	23	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	6	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA or math	3	11	6	10	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	24	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	4	17	12	14	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	5	9	1	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	116	87	100	101	71	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	14	26	24	23	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	6	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA or math	3	11	6	10	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	24	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	4	17	12	14	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	5	9	1	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	40%	52%	56%				52%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						56%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						51%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	39%	46%	50%				49%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	46%						58%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						42%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	50%	59%				51%	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	51%	60%	-9%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	59%	-8%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

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	43%	59%	-16%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	48%	53%	-5%	53%	-5%

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	13	41	43	20	43	33	10				
ELL	39	56		22	40		25				
BLK	28			11							
HSP	41	47	29	34	45	40	33				
MUL	36			36							
WHT	42	62	57	44	44	39	33				
FRL	40	56	44	37	46	44	35				
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	16	50	64	24	27		26				
ELL	42			25							
BLK	18			8							
HSP	40	53		34	56		56				
WHT	36	38	50	45	39	25	33				
FRL	33	42	69	35	41	31	33				
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	33	53	55	25	53	50	25				
ELL	45			45							
BLK	47			35							
HSP	48	43	36	48	48	36	33				
MUL	62			38							
WHT	52	60	57	51	60	45	52				
FRL	47	52	50	44	55	41	48				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	351
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	38
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	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
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	36
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	46
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	43
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?

Majority of students are making learning gains, but not achieving overall proficiency. The subgroups of Hispanics, ELL and Students with Disabilities all receive additional services inside the instructional day. This brings up the question of the validity of those additional services, are they truly meeting their needs? Math continues to be a weaker content area across the board. 3rd grade increased their math proficiency, but 5th grade went down. This brings up the concern over the lack of math interventions.

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

Based off of low proficiency in both ELA and Math, we have to focus intensely on grade level interventions. MTSS interventions helped narrow the gaps, but due to such large gaps in proficiency, more is needed to close those gaps. A focus on essential standards during team planning time is also needed to occur in the PLC planning cycles.

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement include the need to increase student proficiency. Although all grade levels implemented a solid MTSS intervention block, more work is needed, exposing the students to grade level standards instead of prior grade level standards as well as enriching those students that are at or above the proficiency levels.

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

Grade 3 math and reading increased in proficiency levels. This is due to a solid MTSS structure for interventions. ELA learning gains, as a school, went up 19 points.

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

Grade 3 math and reading increased in proficiency levels. This is due to a solid MTSS structure for interventions. ELA learning gains, as a school, went up 19 points. This too is due to a school-wide push for interventions. All teachers, all instructional assistants and all support facilitators contributed to this increase.

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

Accelerated math classes in grades 3-5. Each grade level team will have a higher performing class that will be exposed to more advanced learning opportunities that will include: project based learning, literature circles, independent projects, ZEARN and Lexia usage to help accelerate.

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.

Math block: Eureka plus Zearn and staff development for the B.E.S.T math standards by district math supervisors.
MTSS: Continuing our intervention work with additional PD and training on the new MTSS SIT,SBLT, SBIT teams and data collection tools. MTSS training on teacher based intervention teams will also be implemented after initial training.

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

Hired a reading interventionist, along with two academic tutors to provide each grade level with additional support for intervention groups. MTSS Watch parties will continue this year which provides a 2-3 week analysis of intervention data presentations with the academic coaches, admin and support facilitators. Tbits will come back for each grade level and provide time to discuss students at risk and to create a teacher based intervention plan that will track services and interventions before the child is brought up to the school-wide intervention team. A support staff member (psychologist, social worker, guidance, admin, reading team...will all join a selected grade level to assist in the problem identification and solving process).

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

:

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
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.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

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

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

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 Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Instructional staff ensures all students have access to grade level, rigorous, core instruction with a systematic level of support that meets the needs of all learners.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	According to our MTSS walkthrough report from February 2022, our next steps will be to focus on the quality indicators of entry/exit criteria, frequent progress monitoring, and intentional questioning. A new district walkthrough tool will be developed so that data from the above areas can be collected. By February 2023, we will increase the classrooms using entry/exit criteria, frequent progress monitoring, and intentional questioning to 50%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Administrative Instructional and MTSS Walkthroughs • HMH Module Assessments • Progress Monitoring Assessments • DIBELS • Lexia • Watch Parties including team data analysis • Monitoring for Achievement Days • Common Formative Assessments during intervention time • MTSS binders • MTSS and Instructional Walkthroughs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lee Anne Keith (lyerkey@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	• MTSS Focus PLCs • Common Intervention Time • Intentional Planning • Data Analysis (DIBELS and Progress Monitoring Assessments)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Based off the 21-22 FSA data, our major focus for the 22-23 school year is increasing our overall ELA and Math proficiencies.

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.

• District training/support around focus areas of quality indicators
• DIBELS PD
• Universal Design of Learning
• Early Release Days/Specialization PD

Person Responsible   Lee Anne Keith (lyerkey@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

According to our MTSS walkthrough report from February 2022, our next steps will be to focus on the quality indicators of entry/exit criteria, frequent progress monitoring, and intentional questioning. A new district walkthrough tool will be developed so that data from the above areas can be collected. By February 2023, we will increase the classrooms using entry/exit criteria, frequent progress monitoring, and intentional questioning to 50%.

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

According to our MTSS walkthrough report from February 2022, our next steps will be to focus on the quality indicators of entry/exit criteria, frequent progress monitoring, and intentional questioning. A new district walkthrough tool will be developed so that data from the above areas can be collected. By February 2023, we will increase the classrooms using entry/exit criteria, frequent progress monitoring, and intentional questioning to 50%.

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)

According to our 2022 Winter MAP scores, in K-2, 40% of our students are scoring at the 50th percentile or higher. By Spring 2023, we will increase these overall proficiencies to 50%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

According to our 2022 Winter MAP scores, 36% of our 3-5 students are projected to score proficient on FSA. By Spring 2023, we will increase these overall proficiencies to 50%.

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.

• HMH Module Assessments
• Progress Monitoring Assessments
• DIBELS
• Lexia
• SBLT data monitoring
• Mid and End of Module Eureka Assessments
• Eureka Equip
• PLC data
• SWAT Common Formative Assessment data

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

Keith, Lee Anne, lyerkey@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?

• HMH Module Assessments
• DIBELS
• Lexia

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?

We will continue to use the district aligned materials to help increase overall proficiencies.

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
• District training/support around focus areas of quality indicators • DIBELS PD • Universal Design of Learning • Early Release Days/Specialization PD	Keith, Lee Anne, lyerkey@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.

Staff members collaborate to ensure the school culture is fruitful in increasing student achievement and the social emotional well-being of all.

• Orange Frog Theory (work with the Happiness Advantage)
• Conscious Discipline Year 2
• PBIS School
• Safety Patrol
• Student-based clubs
• Goal Setting
* Monthly staff outings/after hour gatherings

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

According to our 2021-2022 Gallup Survey, our staff engagement was 35%. By the 2022-2023 Gallup Survey, we will increase our staff engagement to 50%.

Orange Frog Theory Patrol--staff committee in charge of promoting a positive staff culture
Behavior Team--professional development on Conscious Discipline strategies and activities
Student Based Clubs: Coaches Corner, Girls on the Run Club, Boys on the Run Club, Safety Patrol. Future Teachers of America student clubs, all led by staff members.

Sunshine Committee-- staff members collect dues and plan staff celebrations and monthly outings.