

Pasco County Schools

Schrader Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 |

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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

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

- HMH 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 |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.