

Pasco County Schools

# Richey Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Richey Elementary School

6850 ADAMS ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Amy Denney Haskedakes**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: D (40%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CSI

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Richey Elementary School

6850 ADAMS ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://res.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	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

### School Grades History

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

We exist to create a safe, empathetic, inclusive environment, where all participants can positively impact the global community through an inquiry process using strong instruction, deep engagement, and high expectations, to develop collaborative, compassionate, and confident learners.

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

To accomplish this mission, Richey Elementary's success plan has three priorities that closely align with the district priorities: High Impact Instruction, Data-Driven Decisions, and Collaborative Culture.

### 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
Haskedakes, Amy	Principal	
Tricozzi, Tracey	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Amy Denney Haskedakes

**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.*

**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.*

#### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

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

604

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

3

#### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	6	23	46	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	12	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	1	4	20	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
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	45	34	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	41	36	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	11	41	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	1	0	1	14	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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	75	110	96	105	104	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	604
Attendance below 90 percent	28	44	29	33	35	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	4	9	8	8	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	0	13	41	15	36	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
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	12	34	35	17	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

**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	75	110	96	105	104	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	604
Attendance below 90 percent	28	44	29	33	35	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	4	9	8	8	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	0	13	41	15	36	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
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	12	34	35	17	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	35%	52%	56%				45%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						51%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						56%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	46%	50%				44%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	39%						51%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						58%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	50%	59%				40%	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	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	59%	-19%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	38%	55%	-17%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	41%	59%	-18%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	31%	57%	-26%	60%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	53%	-18%	53%	-18%
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	43	36	38	40	40	43	47				
ELL	26	50		26	40						
BLK	29			29							
HSP	29	43	43	27	35		24				
MUL	35			29							
WHT	38	39	47	40	45	46	48				
FRL	34	39	44	33	40	46	36				

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	45	24	18	41	25	55	27				
ELL	23	31		27	42						
BLK	27	15		27	31		15				
HSP	33	24	30	25	21		15				
MUL	35			32							
WHT	43	21		40	35		34				
FRL	39	20	17	33	32	63	27				
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	34	52	53	37	53	55	30				
ELL	29	50		30	57	67	8				
BLK	29	47		33	27						
HSP	40	49	56	36	52	62	28				
MUL	52	75		52	46						
WHT	49	49	50	49	55	57	47				
FRL	45	50	57	44	51	58	41				

### 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	322
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
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	29
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	34
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	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	43
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	39
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?

Our ELA learning gains increased in every subgroup (minimum of +12 points).  
 Our ELA L25% learning gains increased in every subgroup (minimum of +13 points).  
 Our Math learning gains increased in every subgroup (minimum of +8 points) with the exception of our ELL which decreased by 2 points.  
 Our Math L25% learning gains decreased in all but one subgroup.  
 Science achievement increased in every subgroup (minimum of +9 points)  
 Our overall ELA achievement decreased by 3 points.  
 Our overall Math achievement increased by 2 points.  
 Our overall Science achievement increased by 14 points.

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

Based on our 2022 data, we need to increase our overall ELA and Math achievement.

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

COVID and the related struggles that were created: In the prior year, half our students were on computers at home or quarantined for 10+ days multiple times, teachers were out in quarantine for 10+ days multiple times, and it was modified curriculum both online and in person in order to ensure it was the same thing in both delivery methods. In the most recent year, we had to face increased gaps in learning due to the prior year. Although our data improved, we still have growth to make.

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

Our ELA learning gains increased in every subgroup (minimum of +12 points).  
 Our ELA L25% learning gains increased in every subgroup (minimum of +13 points).  
 Our Math learning gains increased in every subgroup (minimum of +8 points).  
 Science achievement increased in every subgroup (minimum of +9 points)  
 Our overall Science achievement increased by 14 points.

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

We were able to provide interventions based on the student needs, daily both tier 2 and tier 3, due to the lifted COVID restrictions. Staff created our Unit of Inquiries that allowed for an increased over of learning and deeper Science content.

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

Continued development of our Unit of Inquiries to include deeper focus on ELA content and the opportunities to engage students in building background knowledge and real world experiences. Our tier 2 interventions will continue to be streamlined and more systematic with detailed action plans that allows for every student to have skill based focused groups.

**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.**

Conscious Discipline (Academic and Behavior Engagement)  
IB PYP focused on Student Goal Setting & Student Led Conferences, Making Thinking Visible, Rubric Writing, Making Transdisciplinary Learning Come Alive, Leveraging Students to Take Action, Importance of Constructed Learning and Questioning in the Learning Environment  
ELA PD focused on Writing  
IB PYP focused on Making Thinking Visible  
Kagan Structures  
MTSS PD  
Unpacking Science Standards

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

These supports and professional development opportunities are being conducted with every grade level to ensure that all students, no matter the grade, are benefiting from this work

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.**

Student proficiency will improve over the course of the year with many opportunities to build background knowledge and provide and engage in real world experiences.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Student proficiency and growth will improve over the course of the year with many opportunities to build background knowledge and provide and engage in real world experiences. This will be measured by:

- Grade level teams will utilize the PLC guiding questions and the IPG tool in order to design meaningful and rigorous learning experiences as evidenced in six complete Unit Planners per grade level.
- Student engagement, as measured by Core Action walkthroughs, will increase to 60% of classrooms engaging students in rigorous tasks that demonstrate understanding of the standards.
- ELA, Math, and Science data will improve from BOY to EOY by 20%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Grade level teams will design meaningful and rigorous learning experiences as evidenced in six complete Unit Planners per grade level.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is Kagan Cooperative Structures and International Baccalaureate Primary Years Program Framework for instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Our overall achievement data has identified a need for improvement in this area.

**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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Academic and Social Behavior****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our school family will understand and develop trauma sensitive classrooms, while using Conscious Discipline strategies. The referral and incident data from 21-22 identified this need.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Academic and behavioral engagement will increase with this work. This will be measured by:

- Referral and Incident data will decrease by 50% through successful implementation of CD.
- Through the Gallup, our Student Hope measurement will increase by .20
- Data will show a 30% increase in the success of our tier 2 plans.

**Monitoring:**

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

Referral and incident data will be monitored monthly by our School Intervention Team. This data will also be present to the Conscious Discipline Action Team (CDAT).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is Conscious Discipline self-regulation strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Self-regulation is a skill that is essential for social, emotional, academic and life success.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

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

PLCs will engage with a collective responsibility to intentionally plan, deliver, and monitor progress of targeted, quality interventions that increase student achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Student proficiency and growth will improve over the course of the year as evidenced through detailed action plans that allows for every student to have skill based focused groups. This will be measured by:

- Detailed Acceleration Plans for every student, in all grades, that accounts for skill-based focused group placement, that accounts for each week of instruction.
- ELA, Math, and Science data will improve from BOY to EOY by 20%.
- Our lowest performing students will improve by 10% in the proficiency and growth scores in ELA & Math.

**Monitoring:**

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

Detailed Acceleration Plans for every student, in all grades, that accounts for skill-based focused group placement, that accounts for each week of instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is MTSS.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Our overall achievement data has identified a need for improvement in this area.

**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***

**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**

Student proficiency will improve over the course of the year with many opportunities to build background knowledge and provide and engage in real world experiences.

Grade level teams will design meaningful and rigorous learning experiences as evidenced in six complete Unit Planners per grade level.

PLCs will engage with a collective responsibility to intentionally plan, deliver, and monitor progress of targeted, quality interventions that increase student achievement.

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

Student proficiency will improve over the course of the year with many opportunities to build background knowledge and provide and engage in real world experiences.

Grade level teams will design meaningful and rigorous learning experiences as evidenced in six complete Unit Planners per grade level.

PLCs will engage with a collective responsibility to intentionally plan, deliver, and monitor progress of targeted, quality interventions that increase student achievement.

**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)**

- Grade level teams will utilize the PLC guiding questions and the IPG tool in order to design meaningful and rigorous learning experiences as evidenced in six complete Unit Planners per grade level.
- Student engagement, as measured by Core Action walkthroughs, will increase to 60% of classrooms engaging students in rigorous tasks that demonstrate understanding of the standards.

- ELA, Math, and Science data will improve from BOY to EOY by 20%.
- Detailed Acceleration Plans for every student, in all grades, that accounts for skill-based focused group placement, that accounts for each week of instruction.
- Our lowest performing students will improve by 10% in the proficiency and growth scores in ELA & Math.

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

- Grade level teams will utilize the PLC guiding questions and the IPG tool in order to design meaningful and rigorous learning experiences as evidenced in six complete Unit Planners per grade level.
- Student engagement, as measured by Core Action walkthroughs, will increase to 60% of classrooms engaging students in rigorous tasks that demonstrate understanding of the standards.
- ELA, Math, and Science data will improve from BOY to EOY by 20%.
- Detailed Acceleration Plans for every student, in all grades, that accounts for skill-based focused group placement, that accounts for each week of instruction.
- Our lowest performing students will improve by 10% in the proficiency and growth scores in ELA & Math.

### **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.

Grade level teams will design meaningful and rigorous learning experiences as evidenced in six complete Unit Planners per grade level.

Detailed Acceleration Plans for every student, in all grades, that accounts for skill-based focused group placement, that accounts for each week of instruction.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Haskedakes, Amy, adenneyh@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?

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is Kagan Cooperative Structures, International Baccalaureate Primary Years Program Framework for instruction, and MTSS.

**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?

Our overall achievement data has identified a need for improvement in this area.

**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
Professional Learning: MTSS	Haskedakes, Amy, adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching: Grade level and Individual Supports	Taylor, Angela, angtaylo@pasco.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning: IB PYP focused on Student Goal Setting & Student Led Conferences, Making Thinking Visible, Rubric Writing, Making Transdisciplinary Learning Come Alive, Leveraging Students to Take Action, Importance of Constructed Learning and Questioning in the Learning Environment	Burr, Shaun, sburr@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.**

The foundation of Richey Elementary is the school culture and environment. Our work centers around the school family and creating a sense of safety for all! The building in our positive culture happens throughout

each day on our campus. From our strong school spirit, our Dance Party Friday's, Richey Royalty, Family Events (Turkey Trot, Family Night Out, Richey RoundUp, Winter Wonderland, Trunk or Treat), to our deep engagement in Conscious Discipline. Our staff works to understand and develop trauma sensitive classrooms that not only support our students, but their families also. Relationships are the foundation of all the work we do and that continues to only increase our positive school culture and environment.

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

At Richey we are lucky to be surrounded by many stakeholders that support our work and continue to help promote our positive school culture and environment. Our families support students in partnership with the school by being involved in the development of the whole child and by keeping the lines of communication open with staff and the school. Various community members support our school through participation and involvement in school events. Business partners provide donations to support our school family in helping us meet the needs of all learners. Teachers provide authentic learning opportunities for students in a learning environment that encourages them to ask questions and to discover the love of learning. They provide tiered levels of support to ensure all students feel safe and, feel a part of our school family. Students support by building strong relationships with the school family and taking on leadership roles. Students will create a school they feel proud to attend.