# Seven Springs Elementary School



# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Seven Springs Elementary School

## 8025 MITCHELL RANCH RD, New Port Richey, FL 34655

### https://sses.pasco.k12.fl.us

## Demographics

## Principal: Jimmy Rodriguez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 74% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (45%)<br><br>2018-19: C (46%)<br><br>2017-18: C (47%) |
| **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.](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

# Seven Springs Elementary School

## 8025 MITCHELL RANCH RD, New Port Richey, FL 34655

## https://sses.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 | 74% |

| **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.**

At Seven Springs Elementary School, we believe in fostering a safe, equitable, and compassionate community where we establish life-long learners.

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

Seven Springs Elementary School: Inspiring lifelong learners.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Rodriguez, Jimmy | Principal | Lead the School Leadership Team |
| Stine, Sandra | Assistant Principal | Assist in leading the School Leadership Team |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Thursday 7/1/2021, Jimmy Rodriguez

**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.*
10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
22

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
451

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**
2

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**
4

**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 | 67 | 75 | 76 | 78 | 68 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 431 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 1 | 17 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 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 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in ELA or math | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

**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 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

**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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 9/6/2022

**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 | 71 | 74 | 63 | 75 | 63 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 20 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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 | 2 | 23 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Course Failure in ELA or math | 0 | 4 | 6 | 24 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Level 1 in ELA or math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

**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 | 2 | 11 | 5 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |

**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 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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 | 71 | 74 | 63 | 75 | 63 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 20 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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 | 2 | 23 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Course Failure in ELA or math | 0 | 4 | 6 | 24 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Level 1 in ELA or math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

**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 | 2 | 11 | 5 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |

**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 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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 | 48% | 52% | 56% | | | | 49% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 55% | | | | | | 53% | 56% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | | | | | | 62% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 41% | 46% | 50% | | | | 45% | 60% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 49% | | | | | | 36% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 40% | | | | | | 45% | 50% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 40% | 50% | 59% | | | | 29% | 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 | 57% | 60% | -3% | 58% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 59% | -10% | 58% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 55% | -20% | 56% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |

| 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 | 57% | 59% | -2% | 62% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 62% | -17% | 64% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 57% | -30% | 60% | -33% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -45% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 53% | -26% | 53% | -26% |

| 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 | 17 | 46 | 39 | 20 | 43 | 41 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 16 | 43 | | 26 | 38 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | | | 15 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 46 | 36 | 27 | 42 | 27 | 29 | | | | |
| MUL | 29 | 54 | | 43 | 54 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 62 | 46 | 49 | 52 | 50 | 54 | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 49 | 41 | 34 | 43 | 32 | 28 | | | | |

| 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 | 22 | 13 | 17 | 14 | 20 | 33 | 22 | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | | | 13 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 13 | | | 21 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 38 | | 21 | 13 | | 44 | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | | | 20 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 30 | | 45 | 22 | 27 | 42 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 25 | 27 | 34 | 27 | 43 | 40 | | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 22 | 36 | 45 | 27 | 27 | 32 | | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 53 | | 28 | 33 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 56 | | 44 | 34 | | 35 | | | | |
| MUL | 44 | | | 38 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 52 | 61 | 46 | 34 | 40 | 25 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 54 | 64 | 39 | 35 | 44 | 28 | | | | |

## 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 | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 57 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 375 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 36 |
| 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 | 22 |
| 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 | 37 |
| 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 | 45 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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?**

We are below the state and district in every FSA reporting category.

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

We are furthest below the district and state (-10%) in math achievement. We are only at 48% in ELA achievement and 45% in our lowest quartile.

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

Potential lack of clear focus/intensity during the Tier 1 instructional planning process. There are times where we leave teaching and learning experiences to chance instead of planning for moments of learning and problem solving that will eventually lead to desired outcomes.

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

Our learning gains improved in both Math and ELA by over 20% each.

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

As a school, we focused on curriculum and planning during the PLC at levels that the school had not seen in the last few years.

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

We have to continue to get better at the student tiered problem solving process, while still strengthening Tier 1 instruction.

**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.**

-Utilize school and district coaching supports to gain an understanding and build a knowledge base around the new Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in Math and corresponding instructional materials and curriculum
-Continue to expand our knowledge of the Instructional Practices Guide (IPG), targeting Core Actions 2 and 3 for all content areas and utilizing Learning Walks to monitor high-leverage instructional practices.

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

-Align instruction and differentiation to the rigors of the standards and to common formative assessment data
-Continue to build knowledge around the Science of Reading and the relationship between the ELA Framework, BEST standards, and HMH through our extended PLC schedule.

**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 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.** | Our student performance outcomes dropped significantly from 2019-2021.<br><br>2019<br>ELA 49%<br>ELA LG 53%<br>ELA L25 62%<br>Math 45%<br>Math LG 36%<br>Math L25 45%<br>Science 29%<br>Total 319<br>319/700=46%<br><br>2021<br>ELA 45%<br>ELA LG 30%<br>ELA L25 32%<br>Math 35%<br>Math LG 21%<br>Math L25 32%<br>Science 39%<br>Total 234<br>234/700=33%<br><br>After acknowledging the Opportunity Myth and committing to making sure we do our part to close gaps, we are committed to providing grade appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and holding high expectations. To accomplish this we are committed to planning intentionally for Core Action components from the Instructional Practices Guides. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Student achievement on the FSA will increase in all academic areas.<br><br>In order to regain our status from 2019 and make the gains necessary to set ourselves up for future successes, our goal is to increase student performance by at least the following:<br><br>ELA by 4%<br>ELA LG by 10%<br>ELA L25 by 15%<br>Math by 5%<br>Math LG by 8%<br>Math L25 by 7%<br>Science by 4% |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for** | FAST data throughout the year |

**the desired outcome.**

| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jimmy Rodriguez (jirodrig@pasco.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Throughout the year, we will be providing professional development geared toward aligning instruction and differentiation to the rigors of the standards and to common formative assessment data. We will also continue to build knowledge around the Science of Reading and the relationship between the ELA Framework, BEST standards, and HMH through our extended PLC schedule. During PD sessions we will also continue to expand our knowledge of the Instructional Practices Guide (IPG), targeting Core Actions 2 and 3 for all content areas and utilizing Learning Walks to monitor high-leverage instructional practices. |
|---|---|

| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Our student performance outcomes dropped significantly from 2019-2021.<br><br>2019<br>ELA 49%<br>ELA LG 53%<br>ELA L25 62%<br>Math 45%<br>Math LG 36%<br>Math L25 45%<br>Science 29%<br>Total 319<br>319/700=46%<br><br>2021<br>ELA 45%<br>ELA LG 30%<br>ELA L25 32%<br>Math 35%<br>Math LG 21%<br>Math L25 32%<br>Science 39%<br>Total 234<br>234/700=33% |
|---|---|

After acknowledging the Opportunity Myth and committing to making sure we do our part to close gaps, we are committed to providing grade appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and holding high expectations. To accomplish this we are committed to planning intentionally for Core Action components from the Instructional Practices Guides.

## 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 description entered*

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |
|---|---|

| #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | If we utilize data to drive decision-making, collaboration and student achievement outcomes for all learners will increase. Walkthrough data, assessment data, and qualitative data aligned to demonstrate a need for us to raise our expectations as it relates to data collections, data use, and data-based decision making. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | Teacher collaboration and instructional implementation expectations will improve, as a result, student achievement on the FSA will increase as follows: ELA by 4% ELA LG by 10% ELA L25 by 15% Math by 5% Math LG by 8% Math L25 by 7% Science by 4% |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | We will monitor FAST data. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | [no one identified] |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | a. Continue to utilize common schoolwide plans for incentives and discipline, and common team plans for grading expectations and parent communication. b. Monitor and analyze DIBELS, HMH Module Assessment, Affirm and MAP data within PLCs and across grade levels to appropriately plan and execute Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. c. Schedule 30-minute common grade level intervention time daily with support from available staff. d. Continue to build capacity within our School Intervention Team around MTSS. e. Continue to build Conscious Discipline knowledge for staff and students. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | If we utilize data to drive decision-making, collaboration and student achievement outcomes for all learners will increase. Walkthrough data, assessment data, and qualitative data aligned to demonstrate a need for us to raise our expectations as it relates to data collections, data use, and data-based decision making. |

**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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to student and staff engagement | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | If we focus on appropriately embedding Conscious Discipline strategies while intentionally meeting the social emotional needs of our students and staff, then engagement will increase school-wide. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | The percent of our referrals in these teacher-student and student-student conflict areas will decrease by 6%. The percent of Student engagement as determined by Gallup will increase by 10%.<br><br>As a result, student achievement on the FSA will increase as follows:<br>ELA by 4%<br>ELA LG by 10%<br>ELA L25 by 15%<br>Math by 5%<br>Math LG by 8%<br>Math L25 by 7%<br>Science by 4% |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | We will monitor data from Early Warning Systems, Gallup Poll, and the FAST. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | [no one identified] |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | a. Structured time for staff to implement morning meetings focused on building compassionate classrooms, problem-solving skills, and executive functioning skills.<br>b. We will seek feedback regarding academic and social-emotional well-being<br>c. Continue our system of positive recognition for staff and students<br>d. Staff will continue to receive timely, actionable feedback |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | We recognize our students need assistance in peer-conflict. We are making an effort to increase our teachable moments as they relate to behavior. We want our teachers to be equipped with the impactful words and phrases needed to frame behavior situations as the arise in the moment. Our ODR count in the areas of Fighting, Disrespect, Failure to Comply, and Disruptive behavior is at a high level. Currently 82% of our referrals are from these categories. That is up 6% from last year. |

**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

-Align instruction and differentiation to the rigors of the standards and to common formative assessment data
-Continue to build knowledge around the Science of Reading and the relationship between the ELA Framework, BEST standards, and HMH through our extended PLC schedule.

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

-Align instruction and differentiation to the rigors of the standards and to common formative assessment data
-Continue to build knowledge around the Science of Reading and the relationship between the ELA Framework, BEST standards, and HMH through our extended PLC schedule.

**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)**

70% of students in grades K-2 will meet growth proficiency in PM2 on the STAR Literacy assessment. In PM 3, 51% will meet proficiency as measured by the scale score.

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

70% of students in grades 3-5 will meet growth proficiency in PM2 on the FAST assessment. In PM 3, 51% will meet proficiency with a level 3 or higher.

**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.

Walkthroughs, lesson plans, PLC's, and assessment data.

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

Rodriguez, Jimmy, jirodrig@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?

Utilize district approved curriculum and materials aligned to the rigor of the B.E.S.T. standards. Follow district created scope and sequence guides.

**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?

Curriculum material are vetted through Pasco County adoption process.

**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 |
|---|---|
| Educators will participate in professional learning centered around deepening knowledge of the instructional practices of the (Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) and B.E.S.T. Standards. | Rodriguez, Jimmy, jirodrig@pasco.k12.fl.us |

Professional learning will be delivered to staff regarding Kagan cooperative learning to increase student engagement.

## 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.**

If we focus on appropriately embedding conscious discipline strategies while intentionally meeting the social, emotional needs of our student and staff, then engagement will increase schoolwide.

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

Teachers- facilitating Brain Smart Start morning meetings (Conscious Discipline structure)
Students- Classroom Commitments for daily success
School Staff- Utilize verbiage from Conscious Discipline curriculum
Community- Share Conscious Discipline Efforts with School Advisory Committee
Families- Discuss positive habits with parents and families during monthly celebrations.