Pasco County Schools

New River Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

New River Elementary School

4710 RIVER GLEN BLVD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33545

https:/nres.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.

We exist to provide a world class education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
Wilkinson, Colleen	Principal	Facilitator of School Leadership Team
Ketterer, Katie	Assistant Principal	Facilitator of School Leadership Team
Raines, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Giorgetti, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Carlson, Laura	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Loo, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Martin, Ellen	Instructional Coach	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Miltenberger, Kristen	Instructional Coach	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Leidy, Jessi	Other	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Robb, Sara	Other	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Leidy, Jon	Behavior Specialist	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Romano, Stella	Other	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Megan	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Mitchell, Holly	Other	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Allen, Casey	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Holland, Amy	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Grey, Frank	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Kerekes, Cailyn	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Wakely, Deanna	Other	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.

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.

The School Success Plan was developed with the input of our leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, and School Advisory Council. Each set of stakeholders was asked to supply their input on specific needs. The SAC committee was comprised of Chris Olsen (parent), Toni Rubel (parent), Kerianne Beckford (Parent), Marielle Fernandez (community member), Val Farmer (parent), Vaneisha Richardson (parent), Jessica Barriner (parent), Tina Owen (parent), Laura Carlson (staff), Robin Ladig (staff), and Amanda Klammer (distric support), and Colleen Wilkinson (principal)

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 school leadership team will meet monthly to determine how the school is progressing towards meeting School Success Plan goals. Based on the data collected through FAST assessments and module assessments, the team will make adjustments to the plan to meet all students needs.

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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	42	25	28	26	16	23	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	1	4	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	14	30	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	30	38	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	9	7	13	0	0	0	29

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	1	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	28	25	17	22	14	20	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	35	28	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	37	43	0	0	0	121
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	1	8	9	2	4	0	0	0	27
Course failure ELA or Math	1	0	2	17	4	8	0	0	0	32

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	3	1	7	9	2	4	0	0	0	26

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	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	28	25	17	22	14	20	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	35	28	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	37	43	0	0	0	121
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	1	8	9	2	4	0	0	0	27
Course failure ELA or Math	1	0	2	17	4	8	0	0	0	32

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	3	1	7	9	2	4	0	0	0	26

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	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*	41	47	53	47	52	56	43		
ELA Learning Gains				53			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			22		
Math Achievement*	35	48	59	44	46	50	37		
Math Learning Gains				51			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			29		
Science Achievement*	39	50	54	35	50	59	44		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	61	59	58					

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	202
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	20	Yes	3	2
ELL	27	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	42			
BLK	24	Yes	1	1
HSP	41			
MUL	40	Yes	3	
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	34	Yes	2	

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	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	60			
BLK	45			
HSP	40	Yes	2	
MUL	39	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	41			35			39					48
SWD	15			21			26				4	
ELL	19			13							4	48
AMI												
ASN	46			38							2	
BLK	33			21			21				4	
HSP	46			38			34				5	44
MUL	37			40			36				4	
PAC												
WHT	43			38			54				4	
FRL	32			27			29				5	50

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	47	53	40	44	51	43	35					58
SWD	13	34	30	17	41	35	11					
ELL	22	62		17	46							58
AMI												
ASN	50			70								
BLK	53	48		38	45	42	41					
HSP	44	50	36	38	53		19					
MUL	36	50		35	36							
PAC												
WHT	48	54	38	48	53	45	36					
FRL	41	49	33	36	49	46	28					

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	43	33	22	37	39	29	44					
SWD	15	15	13	16	35		19					
ELL	9	10		27	30		20					
AMI												
ASN	42			50								
BLK	51	32		32	28		33					
HSP	36	22	15	25	39		36					
MUL	38			38			50					
PAC												
WHT	43	41		45	46		50					
FRL	32	22	13	31	36	43	28					

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
05	2023 - Spring	41%	51%	-10%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	48%	-10%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	94%	54%	40%	54%	40%
03	2023 - Spring	32%	50%	-18%	59%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	29%	54%	-25%	61%	-32%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	52%	-12%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	37%	49%	-12%	51%	-14%

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 third grade ELA scores and our fourth grade Math scores were our lowest scores when compared to previous scores and our other grade levels. Our third grade scores ELA were due to lack of understanding of text comprehension. We have 60% of students that are meeting grade level fluency, but they are unable to comprehend text. Our fourth grade math scores are due to a percentage of students being pulled out for accelerated math. These students took the fifth grade math assessment.

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

Our overall math scores were the biggest decline from the previous year. Our tier I instruction needs to strengthen in teaching students how to independently solve the math problems.

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 math proficiency had the largest gap when compared to the state and district average. Our teachers are struggling to understand the Big M and releasing the work to students. Our student struggle with foundational math skills which has a strong correlation to not being able to access grade level standards.

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

Our ELA learning gains for our lowest quartile made the larges improvement over the last two years. We have a very strong tier III system for closing foundational gaps for students.

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

On the EWS, our 4th and 5th grade math scores had a high number of students scoring a level 1.

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

- Our school will focus on tier I instruction in ELA, Math, and Science.
- Our grade levels will develop rubrics around spotlight standards and develop CFA to monitor students learning.
- Our grade levels will use rubrics and CFAs to identify tier II interventions to fill students gaps of grade level standards.
- Our primary grades will increase students understanding of reading comprehension.

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 Hispanic

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.

Only 40% of our Hispanic subgroup are meeting proficiency.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of Hispanic students will be meeting proficiency.

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

Our Hispanic students will be identified and data from FAST and DIBELs will be collected in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@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.)

For ELA and Math, spotlight standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Rubrics will be developed to monitor students' level of understanding. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because it aligns to our District Key Priorities of high impact instruction and data driven decisions.

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.

1. Spotlight standards are determined for ELA and Math by PLCs.
2. PLCs will develop rubrics and determine common formative assessments to assess spotlight standards.
3. PLCs will analyze data and develop tier II interventions.
4. PLCs will monitor target interventions.
5. PLCs will monitor unit assessments to determine how students are transferring knowledge to summative assessments.

Person Responsible: Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

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.

Only 39% of our Multi-Racial subgroup are meeting proficiency.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of Multi-Racial students will be meeting proficiency.

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

Our Multi-Racial students will be identified and data from FAST and DIBELs will be collected in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@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.)

For ELA and Math, spotlight standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Rubrics will be developed to monitor students' level of understanding. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because it aligns to our District Key Priorities of high impact instruction and data driven decisions.

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.

1. Spotlight standards are determined for ELA and Math by PLCs.
2. PLCs will develop rubrics and determine common formative assessments to assess spotlight standards.
3. PLCs will analyze data and develop tier II interventions.
4. PLCs will monitor target interventions.
5. PLCs will monitor unit assessments to determine how students are transferring knowledge to summative assessments.

Person Responsible: Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

#3. 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.

Only 26% of our Student with Disabilities subgroup are meeting proficiency.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 41% of students with disabilities will be meeting proficiency.

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

Our students with disabilities will be identified and data from FAST and DIBELs will be collected in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@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.)

For our student with disabilities our team will develop strategic schedules to ensure students are gaining access to all levels of support. For ELA and Math, spotlight standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Rubrics will be developed to monitor students' level of understanding. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because it aligns to our District Key Priorities of high impact instruction and data driven decisions.

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.

1. Spotlight standards are determined for ELA and Math by PLCs.
2. PLCs will develop rubrics and determine common formative assessments to assess spotlight standards.
3. PLCs will analyze data and develop tier II interventions.
4. PLCs will monitor target interventions.
5. PLCs will monitor unit assessments to determine how students are transferring knowledge to summative assessments.

Person Responsible: Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

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.

Only 40% of the Economically disadvantaged subgroup are meeting proficiency.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of Economically disadvantaged students will be meeting proficiency.

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

Our Economically disadvantaged students will be identified and data from FAST and DIBELs will be collected in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@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.)

For ELA and Math, spotlight standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Rubrics will be developed to monitor students' level of understanding. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because it aligns to our District Key Priorities of high impact instruction and data driven decisions.

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.

1. Spotlight standards are determined for ELA and Math by PLCs.
2. PLCs will develop rubrics and determine common formative assessments to assess spotlight standards.
3. PLCs will analyze data and develop tier II interventions.
4. PLCs will monitor target interventions.
5. PLCs will monitor unit assessments to determine how students are transferring knowledge to summative assessments.

Person Responsible: Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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.

Build a strong school family by increasing staff, student, and family engagement.

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

Decrease the number of days staff members are absent throughout the 2023-2024 school year. 95% of staff will be present for 94% of the school year.

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

Increase staff attendance by sharing weekly staff attendance in our weekly agenda.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@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.)

Our staff engagement committee will work on increasing staff moral to increase staff attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When staff are present, it increases students academic progress.

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.

1. Staff will be monitored for 0-1 absence per month.
2. When a staff members has 2 or more absences in a month, a member of administration will meet with them to discuss expectations.
3. A plan will be developed to increase attendance.

Person Responsible: Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

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.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

72% of our K-2 grade students are meeting ELA proficiency as measured on the FAST assessment.

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

Only 45% of our 3-5 grade students are meeting ELA proficiency as measured on the FAST assessment.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 80% of our K-2 grade students will be meeting proficiency in ELA as measured on the FAST assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 60% of our 3-5 grade students will be meeting proficiency in ELA as measured on the FAST assessment.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Our students not meeting proficiency in the area of ELA will be identified and data from FAST, DIBELs, and module assessments will be collected and analyzed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wilkinson, Colleen, cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

In the area of ELA, spotlight standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Rubrics for spotlight standards are developed and monitored. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored. PALS, Heggerty, UFLI, SIPPs, HMH comprehension, and fluency will be used for interventions.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Using data from multiple assessments, our teacher teams triangulate the data to determine the targeted remediation need for each students. Through the use of these programs, we have seen evidence that they are closing the gaps of our students foundationally in the area of ELA. Our students in the lowest quartile, that are receiving targeted and systematic remediation using the programs listed above grew by 11 points from the 2022-23 school year.

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
Literacy Leadership -Our Schoolwide Leadership Team meets monthly and will review schoolwide literacy data. -Administrators participate in weekly grade level PLC meetings and will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor core ELA instruction, Tier II interventions, and Tier III remediations.	Wilkinson, Colleen, cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching -Instructional coaches and administrators meet weekly to discuss academic and walkthrough data and develop planning supports for grade levels teams. -This year, instructional coaches and administrators will tier teachers to determine the level of support needed for each individual teacher. Instructional coaches will complete coaching cycles with targeted staff members, and will monitor walkthrough data to determine effectiveness of coaching strategies.	Wilkinson, Colleen, cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us
Assessment -Grade level teams will use Common Formative Assessments to monitor spotlight standards. They will develop rubrics for spotlight standards. This data will also determine their Tier II interventions. -Grade level teams will use end of module assessments to determine mastery of standards. -Universal screeners will be used to determine students in need of Tier III instruction. Our interventionist and academic tutor will work with grade level teams to develop and monitor remediation groups that will occur during our intervention block.	Wilkinson, Colleen, cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning -Monthly Early Release Day time will be used to understand common grading practices, develop rubrics for spotlight standards, develop common formative assessments, and rigorous tasks. Grade level teams will monitor Common Formative Assessments and module assessments. Grade level teams will complete action plans based on the data. -All ELA teachers will participate in monthly professional development around best teaching practices and engagement strategies. Professional development topics will include differentiated instruction, comprehension, fluency, and foundational skills. Walkthrough data will guide our professional development needs as well.	Wilkinson, Colleen, cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Our SIP is shared with our SAC members. We use their feedback to help us determine additional areas that need to be focused on.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our school has scheduled 3 academic family nights that help to build parents knowledge around testing, supports that they are able to provide, literacy, and stem. We also hold two additional family nights to build community. Imbedded within two of those nights are our annual title I meetings where we collect feedback from our stakeholders.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Our school plans to have build in tier II and III instructional blocks within the school day. With these blocks built into the schedule, this will ensure that additional enrichment or remediation are provided. We will also hold ESD and ESY for our struggling learners.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Federal program directors meet quarterly in collaboration meetings to discuss programs across the various funding sources to reduce duplication of efforts and increase efficiency of federal funds.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school has incorporated the state resiliency standards into our weekly instruction. Student are taught skills to help them engage appropriately with peers. Our students services teams meets monthly to

problem solve around school data and makes determinations for tier I, tier II, and tier III supports grade levels, groups of students, and individual students.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Our school has incorporated the state resiliency standards into our weekly instruction. Student are taught skills to help them engage appropriately with peers. Our students services teams meets monthly to problem solve around school data and makes determinations for tier I, tier II, and tier III supports grade levels, groups of students, and individual students.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Every two weeks our school host faculty PD around ELA, Math, Science, and Behavior. All staff are expected to engage in learning to strengthen their tools. Monthly on our Early Release days, staff are engaged in work around standards based grading, understanding and developing rubrics, spotlight standards, common formative assessments, and strong student tasks.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

In the spring, we host a incoming Kindergarten family night to explain the Kindergarten curriculum. Incoming Kindergarten families receive a goody back with a book, whiteboard, alphabet cards, dolch word list, and Kindergarten Readiness checklist. During the summer we host a 2 3 1/2 hour days of Kindergarten Camp where students are able to tour the school, meet all the grade level teachers, learn basic routines. Kindergarten parents and again brought in for a parent university where they learn about their new school expectations and procedures.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	$0.00

5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes