

Pasco County Schools

Crews Lake Middle School. School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Crews Lake Middle School.

15144 SHADY HILLS RD, Spring Hill, FL 34610

<https://clms.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.

CLMS will provide a safe, caring, supportive, and rigorous learning environment to ensure ALL students are engaged and successful learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision:

CLMS is a learning focused school community that strives to engage in continuous improvement.

Core Values:

All Raiders commit to an “All Hands On Deck” approach to ensure that our actions and initiatives are aligned to promote:

- Learning
- Relationships
- Collaboration
- Growth Mindset
- Engagement
- Wellness

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
Lipinski, Paul	Principal	School Improvement Plan Reading English Language Arts Discipline Appeals Allocations Leadership/staff meetings Award Ceremonies School Advisory Council Budget School Culture/Climate Civil Rights School Website/social media EOY Awards Set-up Student Leadership Final appeals for discipline School Improvement Plan Food Nutrition Services Self-Contained ESE Front office/Secretarial Wellness Fundraising Staff Handbook Student Services
Aunchman, Terry	Assistant Principal	Terry Electives Social Studies Career and Technical Education FTE Social Media Athletics COVID Response Community Partnerships School Records EOY Awards paperwork Safety/Drills/Crisis plan ESD/ESY Master Schedule Facilities Worksite Safety Registration/course cards Promotion Recovery SSAP Articulation
Brown, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Head
Casel, Shannon	Teacher, ESE	Special Education Department head

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Figliomeni, Anthony	Instructional Coach	Math Coach Science Coach Tier III Math Intervention
Wiley, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Department Head- Science
Land, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	Department Head- English Language Arts
Lopez, Angel	Teacher, K-12	Department Head- Electives
Ortega, Maria	School Counselor	Student Services Liason
Schneider, Brandi	Instructional Coach	Instructional Trainer Coach- English Language Arts and Social Studies
Cicione, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	Assessment Coordinator
Gonzalez, Stacey	Assistant Principal	Math Supervisor Science Supervisor 6th Grade Student

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.

Our School Improvement Plan development includes our Leadership Team and School Advisory Council. All meetings are open to all teachers. Our SAC meeting are open to the public, including online video call access.

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 monitor our progress towards our goals at various milestones-Progress Reports, report Cards, After Common Formative Assessments, NWEA, FAST PM1-3, End of Unit Exams and quarterly with teachers. We will evaluate the impact of our plan at each milestone and ensure implementation and adjust if the data shows the need.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
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)* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	0	0	0	

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	52	52	45	149	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	14	25	54	
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	95	91	90	276	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	76	51	164	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	91	90	276	

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	27	44	41	112

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	52	52	45	149	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	14	25	54	
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	95	91	90	276	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	76	51	164	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	91	90	276	

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	27	44	41	112	

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	2	2
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*	35	48	49	34	46	50	38		
ELA Learning Gains				37			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			35		
Math Achievement*	48	58	56	51	34	36	47		
Math Learning Gains				61			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			40		
Science Achievement*	31	46	49	44	54	53	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	48	70	68	68	59	58	67		
Middle School Acceleration	55	60	73	53	50	49	35		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					72	70			
ELP Progress	50	35	40	21	65	76	33		

* 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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	267
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	469
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	4	1
ELL	36	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	27	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	41			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	38	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	43			

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	35			48			31	48	55			50
SWD	11			24			10	24	36		5	
ELL	19			44			31	38			5	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			41							2	
HSP	26			50			26	44	44		5	
MUL	40			33			9				3	
PAC												
WHT	37			49			36	50	56		5	
FRL	32			45			29	45	48		6	46

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	34	37	35	51	61	65	44	68	53			21
SWD	12	34	32	30	49	55	14	46				
ELL	23	27	40	46	72							21
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	25	50	55	37	77	79	40	50				
HSP	31	28	29	49	62	61	41	67	61			
MUL	20	31		50	71		40	67				
PAC												
WHT	37	39	34	53	59	65	45	69	53			
FRL	28	34	34	47	60	61	36	60	48			25

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	38	37	35	47	44	40	47	67	35			33
SWD	14	23	25	21	34	31	29	49				
ELL	17	17	8	22	29							33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	46		30	24		36	69				
HSP	39	41	36	45	40	36	34	68	39			36
MUL	31	37		59	58			100				
PAC												
WHT	38	35	34	47	44	40	48	63	33			
FRL	33	36	34	41	39	35	39	59	37			36

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	26%	48%	-22%	47%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	46%	-8%	47%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	48%	*
06	2023 - Spring	31%	46%	-15%	47%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	54%	-17%	54%	-17%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	48%	-7%	48%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	67%	-7%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	31%	46%	-15%	44%	-13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	50%	38%	50%	38%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	70%	-24%	66%	-20%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

ELA FAST PM3 Proficiency in ELA was 32 Percent. Staffing in this department was inconsistent. 6th Grade had one ELA teacher on FMLA twice for extended periods, one ESE-ELA Teacher was on FMLA for more than half of the year. 7th Grade ELA one teacher was new in their first year of teaching. Our ELA coach was newly hired in January with the position vacant from October.

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

Civics EOC Proficiency data had a 22% decline over the previous year. The 7th grade class had fairly significant behavior and engagement concerns throughout the school year.

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.

Civics EOC Proficiency was 22% below the state average . The 7th grade class had fairly significant behavior and engagement concerns throughout the school year.

ELA proficiency 21% below the state average. 6th Grade had one ELA teacher on FMLA twice for extended periods, one ESE-ELA Teacher was on FMLA for more than half of the year. 7th Grade ELA one teacher was new in their first year of teaching. Our ELA coach was newly hired in January with the position vacant from October.

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

Math Achievement increased by 11% in 7th grade over 21-22
Algebra 1 Proficiency Data (88%) showed that we were the 3rd top school in middle school EOC proficiency.

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

Students with Reading/ELA Deficiency.
Math Proficiency

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

ELA Proficiency
Math Proficiency
Civics Proficiency
Science Proficiency
Learning Gains and Proficiency for Subgroups SWD and Black.

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 ELA**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.

Lessons planned and delivered requiring student tasks and assessments matching the rigor of the benchmarks for the grade level. Last year teachers were consistently utilizing grade appropriate resources and the need for rigorous tasks was evident.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will show progress of at least 40% increases on FAST from level 1 and 2 to levels 3 and above from PM1 to PM3, scoring at a minimum of 45% Proficiency in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly classroom walk throughs with a criteria and feedback based on benchmark based assignments and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@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.)

Intensive Reading for students scoring at the 1st achievement level. The courses will utilize researched based skill, vocabulary and grammar building resources and will monitor progress utilizing DIBELS and Lexia.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is supported, researched and provided by our district office. The intervention is individualized for students so that they focus on the exact needs, skills and resources to meet their needs.

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.

Instructional Practice Guide Core Action 2 & 3 professional development based on walkthrough and staff needs assessment data.

Person Responsible: Anthony Figliomeni (afigliom@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 15

Common Board/Classroom Configuration for Bell-to-Bell Rigorous Instruction Focused on IPG Core Action 1-3, WIRCOR- Default to Reading and Summary Activities.

Each Department will have PD based on walkthrough data and self selection of elements from Core Action 2 and 3.

Person Responsible: Anthony Figliomeni (afigliom@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: November 28

Staff professional Development for unpacking standards and lesson planning rigorous tasks and student expectations

Person Responsible: Terry Aunchman (taunchma@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 6, 2023.

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

Lessons planned and delivered requiring student tasks and assessments matching the rigor of the benchmarks for the grade level. Last year teachers were consistently utilizing grade appropriate resources and the need for rigorous tasks was evident.

This group is our lowest 35%, our SWD and Black Subgroup who are not showing the same proficiency as their peers as well as students not performing proficient or with gains on FAST PM3.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will show progress of at least 40% increases on FAST from level 1 and 2 to levels 3 and above from PM1 to PM3, scoring at a minimum of 55% Proficiency in Math and 97% Proficiency in Alg. 1 Honors.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly classroom walk throughs with a criteria and feedback based on benchmark based assignments and assessments.

PLC and Lesson Planning support and monitoring by Administration and Coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@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.)

Students not mastering grade level standards will be provided intervention in their math classes as well as in separate intervention sessions utilizing the Dreambox math intervention platform.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is supported, researched and provided by our district office. The intervention is individualized for students so that they focus on the exact needs, skills and resources to meet their needs.

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.

Instructional Practice Guide Core Action 2 & 3 professional development based on walkthrough and staff needs assessment data.

Person Responsible: Anthony Figliomeni (afigliom@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: November 28, 2023.

Tier III groups will be established for students needing interventions in Reading and Math.

Person Responsible: Anthony Figliomeni (afigliom@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 18, 2023.

#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 will decrease disruptive behavior and increase on task behaviors in order to positively impact our classroom learning environment. We will utilize our PBIS system to support positive culture among our students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will see a decrease in Classroom Disruptions by 25% over last year's discipline referral data. This will be reviewed each quarter.

Monitoring:

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

Each quarter our Discipline Team will evaluate data trends to address classroom disruptions. If we do not see a positive impact from our data and use of our PBIS system we will problem solve items to positively impact the student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey Gonzalez (smgonzal@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.)

PBIS School Wide System as well as Tier III individual student supports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy is researched based, proven to make a positive impact and focuses on improving, teaching and recognizing positive behavior.

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.

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.

We include our families in the data reflection, needs assessment and improvement planning process through our School Advisory Council meetings. We then present and share the product and plan of these processes in May and August with our families. We hold a Title One Meeting in the Fall and review of the benefits, connections to the improvement plan goals and how our funds are being used as well as our measurable outcomes that we monitor.

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))

This process gives our families voice, input, knowledge and updates regarding our student progress as well as plans and resources to ensure their success.

<https://clms.pasco.k12.fl.us/parent/>

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)

We have included a Bell to Bell common classroom structure to ensure students are engage via well planned lessons and routines.

We are focusing on standards/benchmark based lessons and student assignments as a school via supporting lesson planning, monitoring classrooms, providing feedback and tiered coaching.

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))

This plan included elements of Title One funding guidelines as well as our districts Comprehensive Needs Assessment process.

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 two school counselors who directly support our student needs. Our social worker and psychologist provide and also coordinate mental health services for our students. Our school provides an academic and behavioral support program where students have a check in and check out mentor who provides feedback on progress towards goals. We also provide state approved modules in 7th and 8th grade and in 6th grade health class to promote skill building.

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))

Students participate in individual career interest exploration via our Career and Technical Education Department through state provided CTE resources.

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 Student Services/MTSS team reviews data and identifies students of need and provides tiered behavioral, attendance and academic support.

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))

Our teachers follow a guided assessment and data protocol in their PLCs that identify students who need additional supports and then select a menu of options to support the students.

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))

N/A