

Pasco County Schools

Gulf Trace Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gulf Trace Elementary School

3303 GULF TRACE BLVD, Holiday, FL 34691

<https://gtes.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.

At Gulf Trace, we will create an environment that is willing collaborate with our stakeholders, use data to drive our instruction, and create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gulf Trace Elementary School scholars will use college readiness strategies, develop skills in global perspectives, and become well-rounded learners.

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
Abbatello, Kara	Principal	
Douglas, Courtney	Instructional Coach	
Testoni, Matt	Assistant Principal	

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 the Spring of 2023 we met with staff, leadership and SAC in data discussions. A round robin discussion was held and we discussed what goals need to be adjusted and or changed from our previous SUP. Work groups were formed and each goal was updated and revised using the most recent data.

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))

We hold monthly data chats using the most up to date data to monitor our short term progress. We also have MicroSIT Teams that meet monthly and discuss progress and adjustments that need to happen based on current data. Additionally, we hold a SuPDate every nine weeks with all stakeholders, using the most up to date data to reflect on our work and make adjustments as needed.

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	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	85%
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)* 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: B 2018-19: B 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	39	37	20	34	19	25	0	0	0	174	
One or more suspensions	1	15	5	24	13	13	0	0	0	71	
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	12	28	22	0	0	0	62	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	37	25	0	0	0	75	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	

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	1	9	0	20	14	21	0	0	0	65

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	3	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	5	16	24	11	19	0	0	0	76	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	5	2	3	0	0	0	14	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 in ELA or Math	0	0	0	29	22	4	0	0	0	55	
Course Failure ELA or Math	0	0	6	16	15	11	0	0	0	48	

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	2	9	21	15	8	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	1	5	16	24	11	19	0	0	0	76	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	5	2	3	0	0	0	14	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 in ELA or Math	0	0	0	29	22	4	0	0	0	55	
Course Failure ELA or Math	0	0	6	16	15	11	0	0	0	48	

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	2	9	21	15	8	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	19
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*	34	47	53	38	52	56	36		
ELA Learning Gains				50			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			39		
Math Achievement*	31	48	59	39	46	50	37		
Math Learning Gains				54			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			65		
Science Achievement*	49	50	54	47	50	59	30		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	73	61	59	69			54		

** 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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	219
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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	18	Yes	1	1
ELL	40	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	3	1
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	30	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	41			
FRL	43			

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	43			
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	42			
MUL	32	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	46			

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	34			31			49					73
SWD	11			8			33				4	
ELL	22			26							3	73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			20							3	
HSP	28			28			50				5	69
MUL	27			33							2	
PAC												
WHT	38			32			57				4	
FRL	31			29			48				5	79

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	38	50	51	39	54	35	47					69
SWD	23	67	64	31	39		36					
ELL	28			22								69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	36		28	54		50					
HSP	38	54	50	33	54	36	29					
MUL	25	50		33	18							
PAC												
WHT	42	51	50	44	62	42	59					
FRL	32	51	55	32	50	34	39					71

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	36	37	39	37	60	65	30					54
SWD	19	24		19	25		17					
ELL	47			40								54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	15			26								
HSP	37	27		38	67		42					
MUL	30			26								
PAC												
WHT	44	41	50	42	59	67	29					
FRL	32	39	40	34	61	69	26					

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	45%	51%	-6%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	55%	-20%	58%	-23%
03	2023 - Spring	28%	48%	-20%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	27%	50%	-23%	59%	-32%
04	2023 - Spring	19%	54%	-35%	61%	-42%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	52%	0%	55%	-3%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was overall ELA proficiencies and math proficiencies. Contributing factors included teacher vacancies and the level of highly qualified teachers which affected the quality of day-to-day instruction. Other contributing factors included student attendance and behavior. Trends that have emerged are declining ELA and math scores for the past two years.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is 3rd and 4th grade proficiency math scores. The factors that contributed to the decline include the large number of students in accelerated math who took the 5th grade math assessment as well as learning gaps in our Level 1's and Level 2's.

Another data component that showed a great decline from the prior year is 3rd and 4th grade proficiency ELA scores. The factors that contributed to the decline include teacher vacancies and the level of highly qualified teachers which affected the quality of day-to-day instruction.

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.

The data component that had the great gap when compared to the state average is 3rd and 4th grade proficiency ELA scores. The percentage of Level 1s in 3rd grade include 49% compared to 27% in the

District and 27% in the State. The percentage of Level 1s in 4th grade include 46% compared to 24% in the District and 23% in the State.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 3rd and 4th grade proficiency math scores. The percentage of Level 1s in 3rd grade include 56% compared to 28% in the District and 24% in the State. The percentage of Level 1s in 4th grade include 49% compared to 28% in the District and 24% in the State.

The factors that contributed to the decline include teacher vacancies and the level of highly qualified teachers which affected the quality of day-to-day instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is 5th grade proficiency math scores with 45% proficiency. The actions we took were providing a highly qualified teacher that was skilled in her content area and specialized in that subject area.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, potential areas of concern include student attendance and the large number of Level 1s in both ELA and in math.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math proficiency
3. Student attendance
4. Student & parent engagement

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**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.

Collaborative teams will provide well planned, rigorous lessons, aligned to both the Florida B.E.S.T. and Cambridge standards, to maximize staff and student engagement using AVID WICOR and Kagan strategies.

Measurable Outcome:

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

GTES will improve from 36% in ELA proficiency to 45% in ELA proficiency and will improve from 33% in math proficiency to 45% in math proficiency by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through Admin and coaches participating in CTTs regularly; hosting monthly meetings with Team Facilitators to plan agendas, problem solve and share strategies for building team culture; CTT's agendas/notes being maintained in SharePoint with the support of coaches; lesson plans indicating that grade level teams are staying on pace, according to district scope and sequence; and admin and coaches monitoring action plans in collaboration with the Guiding Coalition.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kara Abbatello (kabbatel@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.)

Evidence-based interventions that will be implemented include SIPPS, a research-based foundational skills program that supports new and struggling readers. SIPPS will be used for Tier 3 interventions across grade levels 1-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SIPPS is research-based and District approved.

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.

Action steps include teams using the resources available on the ELN (district approved curriculum, scope/sequence, pacing guides, and focus standards for each grade level); teams planning collaboratively using engagement strategies with ongoing coaching supports, CFAs, and team action plans addressing student performance.

Person Responsible: Courtney Douglas (cdouglas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

The Master schedule includes specific instructional expectations for each block, based on the district frameworks with daily class meeting that utilize TIER 1 Academic and Behavior Curriculum. Clear, daily classroom routines and structures will be used to maximize learning time, create independence, and keep students engaged.

Person Responsible: Kara Abbatello (kabbatel@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

PD around the implementation of the Best Standards, SIPPS, UFLI, and Second Step. The continued implementation of AVID with Kagan - Summer Trainings / CTTs / Staff Meetings / Early Release Professional Development days.

Person Responsible: Courtney Douglas (cdouglas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

The staff at Gulf Trace will use multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) to collectively problem-solve and plan for the support of all students (including lowest performing subgroups: Blk, M, and ELL) using routine Common Formative Assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

GTES will see an improvement in all subgroups overall proficiency scores. All subgroups identified will collectively improve with no subgroups below 41% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

SIT meeting schedule/notes indicating progress monitoring and action planning around at-risk students for each grade level.

- SIT team development/monitoring of Tier 2 and 3 intervention plan, including identifying students needing support, instructional strategies, staff responsibilities, progress monitoring, and data collection.
- Intervention Plans and Progress Monitoring on SharePoint
- Discussions during PLC include conversations around subgroups and evidence on TBIT forms is apparent
- SBIT Referral form

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kara Abbatello (kabbatel@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.)

PD around the district provided MTSS Guidebook including implementation of Team Teaching Assessment Cycle

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The MTSS Guidebook provides evidence-based practices for supporting teachers in implementing differentiated instruction for all students. Resources such as the Team Teaching Assessment provide specific guidelines for building collective PLC practices.

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.

The GTES master schedule includes Tier 2 and 3 intervention and clear expectations for use of these times.

Person Responsible: Kara Abbatello (kabbatel@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Identify specific intervention resources and progress monitoring tools to be used by each grade level.

Person Responsible: Kara Abbatello (kabbatel@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

Collect data from intervention groups in SharePoint, including attendance, assessment results, and anecdotal notes.

Person Responsible: Kara Abbatello (kabbatel@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#3. 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.

Together we will create systems that support positive academic and behavior management and create a common language that all students will learn at high levels and facilitate job imbedded PD to support professional growth to impact student success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Staff engagement on the GALLUP Survey will increase from a 4.07 to a 4.25 and the student engagement on the GALLUP Survey will improve from a 3.88 to a 4.00 or higher by January 2024. GTES will maintain a school-wide implementation in the instructional domain on the AVID CCI by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The SLT will monitor the GALLUP Survey poll outcomes. The AVID Site Team will monitor the Certification and Coaching Instrument.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kara Abbatello (kabbatel@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.)

Use of AVID Systems and magnet program curricula in addition to the MTSS structures.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

AVID is an international program that is steeped in the most current research. Third-party studies, evaluations, and published peer-reviewed research proves the effectiveness of AVID's core beliefs. MTSS framework is critical to the work of evidence-based interventions and data driven progress monitoring for students.

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.

Tier 1 – Regularly scheduled Safer, Smarter Kids through school counselor and Tier 2 – Small SEL groups by referral, targeting specific skills for a designated grade level, rotating every 6-weeks and Mentor Support from

specials teams. Tier 3 –System for identifying students needing individual behavioral support (one-on-one counseling, FBA/BIP, check-in/check-out, etc.).

- Case manager SEL lessons for students with behavior and social skills services on IEP.

Person Responsible: Sondra English (senglish@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

School wide collective commitment to implementing Cambridge teacher and learner attributes, SEL, integrating WICOR and Kagan strategies within academic blocks House/college system for 5th grade based on Cambridge learner attributes to promote leadership and engagement, align school wide behavior systems to Cambridge Attributes.

Person Responsible: Kara Abbatello (kabbatel@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

Maintaining a Guiding Coalition that works to build a culture of collective responsibility and creates Tier 1 and Tier 2 academic and behavior systems.

Person Responsible: Kara Abbatello (kabbatel@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

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

Data reviewed from instructional tools such as DIBELS, SIPPS, NWEA, HMH Assessments, Lexia, Heggerty, End-of-Course and tiered support shows critical need of this primary student group. Coaching teacher teams towards intentionally focusing on foundational reading instruction, progress monitoring, and intensive intervention. Protected tiered supports for students who need intervention.

Grades K-2 will focus on a comprehensive foundational program for Tier 1 and Tier 2 using UFLI. Grades K-2 will develop an understanding of spotlight and supporting benchmarks that are aligned to BEST standards in an effort to prioritize the essential learning targets.

This was identified as a critical need due to 48% of K-2 students falling below proficiency. In addition, DIBELS showed 35% of K-2 students needing intensive supports.

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

Data reviewed from instructional tools such as DIBELS, SIPPS, NWEA, HMH Assessments, Heggerty, Lexia, FAST, End-of-course and tiered support shows critical need of this intermediate student group. Coaching teacher teams towards intentionally focusing on foundational reading instruction, progress monitoring, and intensive intervention. Protected tiered supports for students who need intervention.

Grades 3-5 will focus on the HMH curriculum and the SIPPS program. Grades 3-5 will develop an understanding of spotlight and supporting benchmarks that are aligned to BEST standards in an effort to prioritize the essential learning targets.

This was identified as a critical need due to 64% of 3-5 students falling below proficiency. In addition, DIBELS showed 33% of 3-5 students needing intensive supports.

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

Student assessment results from HMH, DIBELS, SIPP, and CORE 5, and FAST PMP will show growth for students who are performing below level, closing the learning gap.

Based on STAR reading data, grades K-2 are performing at 50% or above. The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase proficiencies in grades K-2 to 55% or higher.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Student assessment results from HMH, DIBELS, SIPP, and CORE 5, and FAST PMP will show growth for students who are performing below level, closing the learning gap.

Overall proficiency for grades 3-5 are 36%. The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase proficiencies in grade 3 from 28% to at least 50% or higher. The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase proficiencies in grade 4 from 35% to at least 50% or higher. The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase proficiencies in grade 5 from 45% to at least 50% or higher.

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.

The Area of Focus will be monitored through monthly SIT meetings, analyzing progress monitoring data, data chats with teacher teams to review CFAs, district and state assessment results. Staff will provide input for completing action plans for improvement.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Abbatello, Kara, kabbatel@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?

Use of district approved Literacy Framework on the ELN supported by curriculum aligned with a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T ELA Standards. School-wide systems built on knowledge of standards and grade level expectations and identifying essential standards that will be taught explicitly, assessed regularly through CFAs, and intervened on through Tier 2 instruction.

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?

District priorities and school commitment to improvement show an identified need for additional supports.

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
SIT/SLT- Monthly meetings to discuss and monitor our progress towards school-wide literacy plans and goals.	
Literacy Coach- Commitment to modeling and coaching in classrooms of new and experienced teachers to improve instruction.	Abbatello, Kara, kabbatel@pasco.k12.fl.us
PLCs - Teams focusing on essential standards, CFAs, and use of district supported instructional resources at each grade level.	

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 Title I plan is shared with stakeholders through SAC meetings, Title I meetings, and parent surveys within the school year. The SIP is shared with stakeholders through SAC meetings, STAR Diner nights, Open House/Title I night using parent-friendly language. The website where the SIP can be found is <https://gtes.pasco.k12.fl.us/>.

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))

GTES has an active School Advisory Council (SAC) which is comprised of parents, teachers, school-related personnel, school administrators, district liaison, and business/community members. Through these monthly meetings, the SAC carefully monitors our school success plan goals, strategies for improvement, and elicit feedback on important school initiatives. Each year, we develop a Parent and Family Engagement Plan with input from our stakeholders.

Each year GTES hosts an Annual Title 1 Meeting in conjunction with Open House for all families at the beginning of the school year. All parents will be provided access to information on school performance data and assistance interpreting their child's individual results. They will be provided a description and explanation of the curriculum and standards used at the school, the forms of assessment used to measure student progress, and the proficient levels students are expected to meet.

We foster parent involvement in the following ways:

Annual Title 1 Meeting; Parent Academies/Curriculum Nights/Learning Fairs/Family Workshops; Recognition Ceremonies; School Advisory Council; Parent/Teacher Conferences;

Parent Teacher Organization Meetings;

Parents contribute to their child's education by providing a supportive home environment

Parents are invited to eat lunch with their children

Parents are encouraged to complete school surveys, which help determine school needs and offerings.

All parents are encouraged to apply with the District School Board of Pasco County to become approved volunteers. GTES value their volunteers. Opportunities include but aren't limited to; mentoring, assisting with classroom teachers, assisting in the media center, office assistant, and lunchroom assistant.

A school/parent compact that outlines how parents and the school staff will share the responsibility for improved student achievement will be developed jointly with parents

We also provide updates to parents and families in the following ways:
Mid-Quarter Progress Reports (myStudent Parent Portal)

Quarterly Report Cards (myStudent Parent Portal)

Parent/Teacher Conferences

PMP Conferences

Daily Communication Folder

We also provide assistance to parents in understanding such topics as:

Florida Best Standards

Grade Level Expectations

Progress Monitoring Plans

State, District, and School Assessments

Title 1 Requirements

Homework Helpers

STEM Fair

This information can be found at <https://gtes.pasco.k12.fl.us/>

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)

Action steps that will strengthen the academic program and increase the amount of quality of learning time include teams using the resources available on the ELN (district approved curriculum, scope/sequence, pacing guides, and focus standards for each grade level); teams planning collaboratively using engagement strategies with ongoing coaching supports, CFAs, and team action plans addressing student performance. The Master schedule includes specific instructional expectations for each block, based on the district frameworks with daily class meeting that utilize TIER 1 Academic and Behavior Curriculum. Clear, daily classroom routines and structures will be used to maximize learning time, create independence, and keep students engaged. PD around the implementation of the Best Standards, SIPPS, UFLI, and Second Step. The continued implementation of AVID with Kagan - Summer Trainings / CTTs / Staff Meetings / Early Release Professional Development days.

GTES also offers Extended School Day that targets students performing below grade level and focuses on reading and math supports in an effort to close the achievement gap. We also provide Extended School Year for students that are not meeting grade level expectations in an effort to close the achievement gap and preventing summer slide.

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.