Veterans Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Veterans Elementary School

26940 PROGRESS PKWY, Wesley Chapel, FL 33544

https://ves.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.

The mission of Pasco County Schools is to provide a world- class education for all students. By working together, parents and the school community can reach this goal and prepare students for success in college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

L- Learning Never Stops
E- Embrace Diversity
A- Amplify Positivity
D- Do What Is Best For All

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
Bidgood, Melissa	Principal	Support and monitor all areas of the SuP.
Pelliccia, Justin	Assistant Principal	Implement, monitor, and support areas of the SuP.
Thompson, Bridget	Teacher, K-12	Support initiatives and monitor goals as part of the Leadership Team.
Coleman, Corie	Teacher, K-12	Implement pieces of the SuP that pertains to instructional initiatives and monitor goals as part of the Leadership Team.
Martinez, Shannon	Instructional Coach	Support and implement initiatives related to Humanities and monitor goals as part of the Leadership Team.
Clayton, Lindsey	Teacher, K-12	Teaches 2nd grade STEM, facilitates 2nd grade PLC and is part of the Leadership Team
Hollingworth, Emma	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Facilitator
Sai, Hilary	Teacher, K-12	PLC Facilitator for 1st grade
Rogers, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade PLC Facilitator
Ward, Caitlyn	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach for STEM and Advanced math teachers for 4th grade.

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.

Each year after our CNA, we provide draft goals to our staff during a staff meeting. The staff from all departments reviews the draft goals, add action steps, questions, wonderings, and any other feedback to each goal. Our parents are able to provide feedback through a survey. The SAC reviews the drafted SuP and adds or deletes based on conversation and analyzing 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))

The admin/instructional coach team will meet weekly with a focus on school-wide data and the SuP each week. At the end of each quarter, the Leadership Team will identify any needs to revise the plan and to monitor progress towards goals.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	18	22	20	22	18	23	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	4	15	0	0	0	22
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	4	12	20	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	16	32	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	4	7	14	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	11
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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	2	6	4	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	29	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	29	42	0	0	0	95
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	

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	2	6	1	3	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	2	6	4	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	29	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	29	42	0	0	0	95
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	

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	2	6	1	3	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	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*	53	47	53	57	52	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				51			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			21		
Math Achievement*	56	48	59	57	46	50	61		
Math Learning Gains				53			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34			26		
Science Achievement*	46	50	54	52	50	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	54	61	59	47			52		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	266
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49

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	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	2	2
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	44			
HSP	48			
MUL	41			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	45			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	59			
BLK	53			
HSP	40	Yes	1	

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	53			
PAC				
WHT	53			
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	53			56			46					54
SWD	33			25			21				4	
ELL	32			38							4	54
AMI												
ASN	50			77							2	
BLK	47			38			27				4	
HSP	43			48			38				5	58
MUL	50			54			18				3	
PAC												
WHT	59			62			55				5	42
FRL	45			44			33				5	55

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	57	51	39	57	53	34	52					47
SWD	29	33	20	33	29	15	21					
ELL	29	42		42	54							47
AMI												
ASN	50			67								

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	47	48		45	52		73					
HSP	51	45	21	47	44	31	36					47
MUL	71	33		58	50							
PAC												
WHT	60	55	42	62	55	37	54					55
FRL	48	43	35	50	47	31	40					46

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	68	50	21	61	41	26	48					52
SWD	32	28	8	27	31		28					
ELL	61			58								52
AMI												
ASN	90			80								
BLK	57	38		53	23		36					
HSP	63	45		47	38	30	45					50
MUL	62			52								
PAC												
WHT	73	57	18	69	48	25	54					
FRL	57	47	10	50	36		57					50

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	44%	51%	-7%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	48%	5%	50%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	50%	15%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	54%	14%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	52%	-12%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	48%	49%	-1%	51%	-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.

Our lowest performance was in the area of proficiency with our 5th grade group. Both ELA and Math dropped (54 to 44 in ELA and 45 to 40 in Mathematics).
A contributing factor may have been not only the change in assessment format, but also the reduction of two strong 5th grade teachers during planning week and this group of students were in grades 2-3 during the Pandemic and received online instruction.

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

Our 5th grade data in both ELA and Mathematics was our only grade level that showed a decline. See above.

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

Our 5th grade group had the largest gap compared to the state. Our Science data (5th grade) also was lower than the State average, however, 19 of our students will be reported during the late reporting window. According to their NWEA Maps data, they should perform well which will increase our 48%.

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

Our 4th grade ELA and Mathematics data showed improvement (60-62% in ELA and 57-68% in Mathematics). I restructured our 4th grade team and looped third grade teachers up to fourth which impacted the growth in a positive manner. PD and coaching opportunities were provided to this new team of teachers which also affected the improvement in scores.

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

ELA data in 3rd and 5th grade is an area of concern and addressed in our plan of action.
Science data for 5th grade with a heavy focus on previously taught grade level standards. Additional formative assessments are part of the action plan.

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

1. ELA Data increase in overall proficiency.
2. ELA Data increase in subgroup of SWD.
3. Science Data overall proficiency increase.

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

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

Our Hispanic subgroup is identified as low-performing based on state assessment results. We are tightly monitoring this group of students and continue to provide professional development for our teachers around the rigor of the standards. This year we are conducting data chats with each grade level to create action plans for subgroups using module/unit data and FAST, DIBELS, and NWEA data.

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

This year, we would like the outcome for the Hispanic population to be a 50% at or above proficiency.

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

Every 6 weeks with PLCs we will monitor Module Assessments, Tier II & III data, DIBELS, FAST Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Pelliccia (jpellicc@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.)

As needed we will follow the Tier II & III Decision Making Trees to determine needs.

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

Helps identify specific needs of each student.

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.

Grouped students based on EOY 22-23 data. Began implementing SIPPs and other reading groups based on student need.

Person Responsible: Justin Pelliccia (jpellicc@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Every 6 weeks it's monitored.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Our SWD across the board have continued to be a low subgroup. This year we have only 2 ESE support facilitators. We do have one 2nd grade teacher who is certified ESE and we have identified her to have ESE second grade students. We have also assigned a 4th grade ELA reading coach to our 4th grade readers who are a year or more behind. Seeing Stars is a program being used with 4 students in 4th grade who have significantly fell behind and are SWD.

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

We would like to see our SWD increase by at least one achievement level on the end of year assessment.

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

Data chats are held with each grade level every 6 weeks. They are monitored and supported by the leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Bidgood (mbidgood@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.)

SIPPS
UFLI
Seeing Stars
Rigby Readers from HMH
FCRR Activities

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

These are all Evidence Based programs that our district provides.

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.

Administration secure the time needed for Tier groups to occur daily.

Ensure teachers who need specific training receive it for their evidence based programs.

Person Responsible: Justin Pelliccia (jpellicc@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly during PLCs

#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.

Attendance is an area with all subgroups and we will be focusing on 'positive culture and environment' in order to increase attendance and reduce tardies.

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

Our tardies will increase by at least 10%. We have purchased a tardy kiosk in hopes to deter families from being late to school.

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

This will be monitored in our office meetings weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Pelliccia (jpellicc@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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

Our evidence based plan is that students need to be in school in order to learn.

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

All students should be in class in order to learn.

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.

Create a monitoring plan once the tardy kiosk is installed. After we review each week, we will be contacting families to see if we can provide assistance to help their child come to school.

Person Responsible: Melissa Bidgood (mbidgood@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Each week we will monitor. Every quarter we will review to see if adjustments need to be made.

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

Following the literacy framework and K-12 reading plan. Analyzing DIBELS data, module data, Renaissance data, and CFA data to ensure students re receiving and needed TIER support. UFLI, Heggerty, HMH, are curriculum resources being used!

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

Following the literacy framework and K-12 reading plan. Analyzing DIBELS data, module data, FAST data, and CFA data to ensure students re receiving and needed TIER support. SIPPS are used for all tier 3 students. Seeing Stars is being used for a group of 4th grade students that are below by 2 years or more. Lexia is used as supplemental as well as imagine learning. Book talks and book clubs are being used in both 4th and 5th grade.

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

5th grade only had a 47% proficiency rate on the ELA State Assessment. We would like to increase the 5th grade proficiency rate to 55% 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.

Every 6 weeks we will have data chats with each grade level. State assessments, DIBELS, SIPPS, HMH Module Assessments will be used to collect data and progress monitor.

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

Bidgood, Melissa, mbidgood@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?

Our core curriculum HMH, is evidence based and meets Florida BEST Standards. Tier II we will use Rigby Readers as well Lexia. Tier III will use SIPPS, which is also aligned with our K-12 plan.

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?

Everything aligns to our district core curriculum and approved programs.

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
Weekly ELA Walkthroughs from our Core Admin Team, with immediate feedback.	Bidgood, Melissa, mbidgood@pasco.k12.fl.us
Monthly Early Release Day Professional Development opportunities.	Martinez, Shannon, salonso@pasco.k12.fl.us
Follow Up and Follow Through of PD	Pelliccia, Justin, jpellicc@pasco.k12.fl.us
Tiering Groups of Teachers to Provide Coaching Cycles	Martinez, Shannon, salonso@pasco.k12.fl.us
Having PLCs review each assessment while planning out the module to ensure questions are at the appropriate rigor.	Bidgood, Melissa, mbidgood@pasco.k12.fl.us
Using CFAs to monitor students needs for tier II support.	Bidgood, Melissa, mbidgood@pasco.k12.fl.us
Needs based PD during weekly PLC times.	Martinez, Shannon, salonso@pasco.k12.fl.us
Teachers participated in TW Learn PD Hub Sessions and will continue to do so throughout the year.	Pelliccia, Justin, jpellicc@pasco.k12.fl.us