Charles S. Rushe Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Charles S. Rushe Middle School

18654 MENTMORE BLVD, Land O Lakes, FL 34638

https://crsms.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.

Charles S. Rushe Middle School will provide a positive, safe environment that promotes literacy throughout the curriculum to prepare all students to be lifelong learners in a global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will achieve 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
Salerno, David	Principal	
Boehmer, Rachel	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.

Members of our SAC reviewed several data points (testing, behavior, Gallup student surveys, etc.) and created goals surrounding these areas. Our Leadership Team then added strategies to help achieve these goals.

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))

A portion of each of our meeting agendas is dedicated to reviewing data on one or more of our SIP goals to discuss the progress we are making on the goal(s).

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	57	80	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	58	62	180
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	47	95
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	40	34	96
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	42	94	191
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	51	61	203
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	55	71	177

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	68	73	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	39	33	101
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	24	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	28	25	76
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	94	93	240
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	59	55	174
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	27	58

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	68	73	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	39	33	101
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	24	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	28	25	76
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	94	93	240
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	59	55	174
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	27	58

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
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*	66	48	49	61	46	50	63		
ELA Learning Gains				50			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			37		
Math Achievement*	79	58	56	71	34	36	67		
Math Learning Gains				70			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			37		
Science Achievement*	58	46	49	59	54	53	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	88	70	68	86	59	58	84		
Middle School Acceleration	63	60	73	76	50	49	61		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					72	70			
ELP Progress	56	35	40	74	65	76	67		

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	653
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	38	Yes	4	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	69			
HSP	62			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	57			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	3	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	57			
HSP	61			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	56			

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	66			79			58	88	63			56
SWD	30			49			24	69	16		5	
ELL	36			63			38	78	46		6	56
AMI												
ASN	83			97			66	100	71		5	
BLK	61			74			52	100	60		5	
HSP	59			70			50	83	61		6	50
MUL	63			81			64	71	59		5	
PAC												
WHT	68			81			60	89	62		5	
FRL	50			67			50	78	42		6	53

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	61	50	39	71	70	67	59	86	76			74
SWD	23	38	35	34	50	51	22	57	22			
ELL	30	35	36	54	66	66	42	65				74
AMI												
ASN	76	59		94	83	90	75	100	93			
BLK	55	38	33	66	65	53	45	88	67			
HSP	53	47	44	60	65	62	54	79	68			75
MUL	53	50	41	68	75	69	57	86	63			
PAC												
WHT	63	50	36	73	70	70	61	87	77			
FRL	46	45	34	56	66	62	45	73	65			67

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	63	51	37	67	49	37	67	84	61			67
SWD	24	36	34	35	41	35	25	61	22			
ELL	38	49	29	43	44	36	29	71	40			67
AMI												
ASN	88	70		88	67		83	96	89			
BLK	53	44	31	55	52	42	70	71	38			
HSP	56	52	36	58	47	35	57	78	57			56
MUL	55	52	35	56	44	35	59	80	54			
PAC												
WHT	65	49	37	70	49	37	70	87	61			
FRL	48	44	35	57	44	33	50	77	42			73

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	62%	48%	14%	47%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	46%	14%	47%	13%
06	2023 - Spring	66%	46%	20%	47%	19%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	71%	54%	17%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	48%	25%	48%	25%
08	2023 - Spring	84%	67%	17%	55%	29%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	55%	46%	9%	44%	11%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	50%	46%	50%	46%

GEOMETRY

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

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	65%	*	63%	*

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	70%	17%	66%	21%

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 FAST assessment, being new, made it difficult to compare growth from the previous year's FSA assessments. However, our review of the data showed that, although students at CSRMS had among the highest proficiency of middle schools in the district, and many made growth in ELA from PM1 to PM3, our SWD subgroup was still not making growth commensurate with their nondisabled peers. Thus, we are once again an ATSI school since this subgroup is below 41% proficiency. Factors that may impact this are the number of new teachers in all core subject areas who do not have the level of literacy teaching strategies as more experienced teachers, and the number of ELA vacancies that were unfilled during the school year.

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

Our greatest decline was in science as evidenced by the Statewide Science Assessment in which only 59% of students scored proficient compared to 65% proficiency in 2022. A review of the data showed that students in one particular teacher's class - a teacher who was new to teaching science and taught two sections of MG Science Advanced Accelerated 2 - scored well below the students in her colleagues' classes. Furthermore, the larger number of students accelerating and taking Physical Science Honors in 8th grade, lowered the number of 8th grade students taking the Statewide Science Assessment.

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.

Although there are areas that we as a school are not happy with, in all data components we performed at or above the state.

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

We were extremely pleased with all data components in math. Not only did our students perform at high proficiency levels, they also demonstrated strong growth from PM1 to PM3, and the growing number of our accelerated math learners performed strongly on the Algebra 1 and Geometry 1 EOCs. Some of the actions our school took to achieve these high levels were offering Intensive Math to students most in need (sadly we are not able to offer this in 2023-24 due to enrollment and subsequently teaching allocation decreases), the tight adherence to curriculum maps and resources, and the support of our district math contacts who worked with our collaborative teams to assist them with Tier 2 resources.

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

The number of students scoring at a level 1 in ELA is concerning, as we know that this has a negative impact on student learning in, not only ELA, but in all subject areas.

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

1. Provide feedback of frequent walkthroughs
2. Establish model classrooms

3. Implement student goal setting and involve them in progress monitoring
4. Data chats with collaborative teams ahead of half-day planning.

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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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 ELA learning gains of students in the bottom quartile was not commensurate with those of all students. Therefore, we will set out to increase learning gains of this subset of students.

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

The ELA learning gains of our bottom quartile will increase to at least 49% as evidenced by FAST PM3 2024 compared to FAST PM3 2023.

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

We will monitor this throughout the year, first with looking at PM1 2023 (fall 23-24) compared to PM3 2023 (spring 22-23) then by reviewing growth from PM1 to PM2 for this year's FAST assessments as well student performance on district assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
David Salerno (dsalerno@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.)

• Have ELA PLCs utilize data to track student progress and make an action plan after each FAST PM throughout the school year.
• Use database to track IPG walkthrough data with a goal of achieving greater than the district average of the respective Core Actions: Core Action 1 (85%), Core Action 2 (70%), and Core Action 3 (60%).
• Offer PD to ensure all teachers have a common understanding of Core Actions and how best to engage students and on curriculum resources that will assist in engaging students.
• Allow teachers to go into model classrooms to see highly effective teachers in action and collect strategies and ideas for their own classrooms.

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

Research has proven that by providing feedback to teachers on a regular basis and offering PD and opportunities for teachers to observe colleagues who are demonstrating highly effective teaching strategies that this has a direct impact on student achievement.

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.

Regular walkthroughs with observations shared regularly both individually and as a whole school.
PD in Core Actions
Identification of model classrooms and opportunities for teachers to observe highly effective teaching.

Person Responsible: Rachel Boehmer (rboehmer@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: By the end of quarter 1, all three actions will be put into place.

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to
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.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

Our students in the bottom quartile are not achieving and making gains commensurate with all students - especially our SWD subgroup. In many cases, levels of support provided, attendance and behavior are reasons that contribute to this lack of performance.

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

Quarterly data as it relates to all areas of EWS - academic performance, behavior, and attendance - will all reflect positive trends.

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

Quarterly indicators will be reviewed by our School Leadership Team and School Intervention Team and the various committees (Instruction and Technology, PBIS and Discipline, School Climate, and Attendance) will review data that is collected and compiled throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Salerno (dsalerno@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.)

Teachers will triangulate achievement data (FAST, EOC, MAP, Quarterlies, CFAs) as well as review behavior and attendance data to determine trends and create a plan for intervention each quarter to increase student achievement.

• Provide PD on data analysis for PLCs (specifically ELA) to encourage teacher engagement with the data.
• Implement a student goal-setting form for students not on-track to review their data and establish goals to get on-track. Teachers can support students by showing them their triangulated intervention data to help students create goals.
• The SIT and SLT will do a middle and end of year check to determine if intervention strategies are positively impacting student achievement.

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

Having PD centered around specific areas of focus and having students participate in goal setting and progress monitoring are both linked to gains in student achievement.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

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

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

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

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

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

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: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$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.

No