
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Dr. John Long Middle School

2025 MANSFIELD BLVD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33543

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Dr. John Long Middle School will provide a safe, relevant, and rigorous learning environment to foster positive relationships empowering our diverse community to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

JLMS Core Value Statements :

Exercise "Best Practices" through participating in a Professional Learning Community.

Demonstrate positive role modeling through consistent leadership with a focus on exemplary ethical values.

Challenge our students to reach their highest academic and social potential by dedicating ourselves to Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships.

Instill positive attitudes while modeling flexibility and enthusiasm.

Create an environment of open communication to foster unity and relationships throughout the school community.

Provide a safe and respectful environment that supports the diversity and ideas of students, faculty, and community.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wolff, Christine	Principal	
Briscoe, Jill	Assistant Principal	
Brooks, Shalonda	Assistant Principal	
Hammond, Victoria	Assistant Principal	
Alderman, Porsche	Teacher, K-12	
Aponte, Maria	Teacher, K-12	
Barrios, Abner	Teacher, K-12	
Danon, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Frenchko, Jay	Teacher, K-12	
Hail, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Kengott, Janet	Teacher, K-12	
Klesius, Mary	Teacher, K-12	
Newkirk, BJ	Teacher, K-12	
Nucamendi, Ginger	Teacher, K-12	
Perugini, Tamari	Teacher, K-12	
Quigley, Cathy	School Counselor	
Ryan, Denise	Teacher, K-12	
Schell, Nicholas	Instructional Coach	
Seacord, Adam	Teacher, K-12	
Vinchesi, Sally	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

In order to involve stakeholders during the school improvement process we focused on assessing strength and area for improvement surrounding school data with the SLT, SAC committee, and faculty. We gathered input using discussion, surveys and polls and utilized this information in the decision-making process how their input was used in the SIP development process.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards by scheduling regular SLT meetings, data dives with instructional staff, and particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap monthly MTSS meetings that focus on monitoring our lowest 35% of students. We will

revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement by scheduling meetings with our leadership and continuously assessing data.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	65	96	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	60	52	159
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	8	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	3	10	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	63	90	209
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	51	73	225
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	45	68	166

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	63	80	193
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	49	44	105
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	9	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	78	94	211
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	90	33	150
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	61	56	193

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	138	182	435

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	63	80	193
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	49	44	105
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	9	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	78	94	211
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	90	33	150
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	61	56	193

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	138	182	435

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67	48	49	60	46	50	62		
ELA Learning Gains				53			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			33		
Math Achievement*	82	58	56	78	34	36	76		
Math Learning Gains				75			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			60		
Science Achievement*	61	46	49	58	54	53	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	88	70	68	86	59	58	83		
Middle School Acceleration	53	60	73	50	50	49	50		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					72	70			
ELP Progress	57	35	40	41	65	76	65		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	610
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	49			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	64			
HSP	62			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	57			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	55			
HSP	56			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	67			82			61	88	53			57
SWD	38			50			35	67	57		5	
ELL	47			73			33	78	36		6	57
AMI												
ASN	84			95			82	97	69		5	
BLK	62			70			49	81	56		5	
HSP	58			78			49	84	45		6	57
MUL	78			87			89	83	64		5	
PAC												
WHT	69			84			64	88	51		5	
FRL	53			70			43	83	31		6	59

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	60	53	40	78	75	69	58	86	50			41
SWD	34	38	26	41	49	44	44	50	33			
ELL	40	45	39	63	72	65	37	60	35			41
AMI												
ASN	75	60	46	94	84		74	91	66			

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	57	45	35	62	64	56	55	73	48			
HSP	51	50	37	73	73	70	50	83	32			43
MUL	62	51	42	81	87	80	70	91	60			
PAC												
WHT	63	55	43	80	76	71	59	89	54			
FRL	50	51	37	68	71	64	48	79	40			39

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	62	54	33	76	70	60	72	83	50			65
SWD	31	36	27	42	52	51	30	56	14			55
ELL	33	46	33	58	61	51	35	64	21			65
AMI												
ASN	78	69		92	75		92	84	72			
BLK	55	47	37	62	71	56	58	77	35			
HSP	54	46	37	67	64	54	61	80	38			70
MUL	74	71		81	75		81	76	75			
PAC												
WHT	64	55	29	80	72	67	74	86	49			53
FRL	49	43	31	61	65	55	61	72	34			69

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	65%	48%	17%	47%	18%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	46%	17%	47%	16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	64%	46%	18%	47%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	80%	54%	26%	54%	26%
07	2023 - Spring	80%	48%	32%	48%	32%
08	2023 - Spring	88%	67%	21%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	62%	46%	16%	44%	18%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	50%	50%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	70%	16%	66%	20%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our lowest area is the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile growth. Some contributing factors include students' vocabulary proficiency and has been an ongoing trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

6th grade ELA showed a decline from 69% proficiency to 64% proficiency. The greatest contributing factor to this was the change of co-hort and building capacity in ELA from elementary.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our data does not have any negative gaps compared to state averages.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our math gains far exceeded the school, district, and state averages. We attribute this to retainment of highly qualified teachers and high engagement teaching strategies.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

There was a notable increase in absences from 21-22 to 22-23

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. It's imperative to continue our forward progress with our tier 2 continuing to build on best practices for reteach and enrichment moving into the 23-24 school year.
2. Building upon on tier 2 improvements we will add a layer of student ownership and responsibility to their learning by incorporating school wide goal setting with our Longhorns. This will allow students the opportunity to set both academic and on-track goals with their classes.
3. Next steps for goal setting has already been discussed with the school leadership team and we have had rich discussion and feedback for next steps moving forward.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Utilizing the data to inform educational decisions our indicators showed an increase in SWD and a decrease in their ELA achievement by SWD in learning gains of the lowest 25%

Measurable Outcome:

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

By providing specific target support using UDL pull out, intentional vocabulary practice, ESE support, and intensive reading with for students with the largest gaps we will be able to see an increase in student growth. This will be measured with a +5 student growth from PM1 to PM2 in ELA .

Monitoring:

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

Action plan for SWD with these specific increases by case managers. Analyzing student data via CFA's and new FAST progress monitoring. Monthly monitoring in MTSS meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jill Briscoe (jbriscoe@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Specific Student Goal Setting
2. UDL framework
3. Intensive math support
4. Intensive reading supports

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To ensure student learning gains among students with disabilities educators must target goals to close learning gaps, pull out SWD for UDL strategies, and provide ample support in intensive math and reading.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our goal is to create a collaborative culture that increases staff and student engagement through positive behavior support systems and increase opportunities for staff engagement and communication. This need was identified utilizing Gallup data and staff/student surveys.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase in teacher engagement from 43% to 50% on the gallup

Increase in indicator for staff I have received recognition or praise for doing good work to 3.8

Increase in student engagement to 40%

Indicated by a specific in student indicator someone has told me I have done good work at school to 3.5 and the adults at my school care about me to 4.0

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored using EWS data, student and staff surveys, and Gallup results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Hammond (vhammond@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- Increase student and staff recognition to include weekly, monthly, and quarterly intervals.
- Increase communication to teachers and parents via monthly newsletters and updates
- Provide more opportunities for staff collaboration and interactions via activities such as staff bingo, scavenger hunts, and escape rooms.
- Focus on implementation of PBIS rewards and increasing PBIS positive referrals and incentives to increase positive student behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The research is clear Positive environments are performance enhancers for staff and students. They are characterized by great results, less turnover, more resilient cultures and healthier staff. Learning to embrace the benefits of positive performance; they then share them naturally with co-workers leading to a positive “rippling” effect inside the work community.

Recognition and incentives through PBIS rewards and positive student referrals will increase student motivation to work and succeed.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

As a system, the Pasco district is engaging in a continuous improvement process always, and annually, we have a more focused reflection to look forward to the next coming school year. During the year, each school reflects and responds to data at the minimum quarterly, and the system engages in regular Calibration Meetings throughout the school year. Additionally, after reflecting on current mid-year data, the system engages in Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). During this time, each school enters a needs assessment process that sets the stage for future planning and includes analysis of student performance, analysis of stakeholder feedback, self-assessment, and site visits. Subsequently, this analysis from each school drives the district planning process and the annual approach to Planning Forward to respond our schools, as well as the allocation of resources in an intentional manner based on the needs identified for each school.

Student Performance is analyzed by reviewing current and trend data by subgroup and school. Data sources include Florida BEST assessments, Statewide Science Assessment, district developed quarterly check results where applicable, and NWEA MAP Growth data. Stakeholder feedback is analyzed by reviewing results from both the student and staff Gallup polls, staff and parent surveys and focus groups.

Multiple tools are used to conduct a self-assessment. Each school and the district use the Cognia Standards for systems accreditation and each school and the district reviews and evaluates its progress toward goals set using the Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE). Instructional Practice Observations, Professional Learning Community (PLC) rubrics, and Tiers of Support rubrics are also completed by each school to gain insight into instructional and support practices.

An Assistant Superintendent, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Specialist, and District personnel engage in individual site visits with school leadership at each school after the school team has completed the first part of their analysis to gain insight into the school's unique needs as well as identify foci for school improvement efforts and needs for implementing the plan.

The conclusion of the CNA results in the identification of the root causes of barriers, the development of a school improvement plan to overcome/reduce barriers to improvement, the allocation of supports needed to implement each school's improvement plan and serves as the foundation for Planning Forward. Schools analyze their plans and basic allocations that will be provided based on district formulas to determine needs for additional allocations, resources and supports. With the school assistant superintendent and the school support team, each school then carefully aligns the additional available funds through Title 1 and/or UniSIG to specific strategies for improvement aimed at reducing barriers to achievement and closing learning gaps for underperforming student groups. This plan for use of additional funding is regularly monitored by the district support team, and is adjusted based on data, including student progress monitoring results, as applicable through the year, with the support of the state BSI team and the Department.