Connerton Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Connerton Elementary School

9300 FLOURISH DR, Land O Lakes, FL 34637

https://coes.pasco.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Connerton Elementary School our mission, through combined effort of staff, parents, students, and community, is to provide students with the behaviors, skills, and knowledge for achievement in school and our changing community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Connerton's vision is Rigor, Relevance and Relationships.

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
Edwards, Kelly	Principal	
Hutchinson, Kendra	Assistant Principal	
Matthewson, Kristin	Instructional Coach	ITC, Math k-5
Woodruff, Amanda	Instructional Coach	ITC, ELA 3-5
Beal, Kim	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Teacher, Grade Level Team Lead
Carlucci, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Teacher, Grade Level Team Lead
Coleman, Marquita	Teacher, ESE	Support Facilitator, Grade Level Team Lead
Engel, Emily	Teacher, K-12	K Teacher, Grade Level Team Lead
Kenney, Heather	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Teacher, Grade Level Team Lead
Kraszka, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Teacher, Grade Level Team Lead
Moore, Jenna	Teacher, ESE	ESE ACP Teacher, Grade Level Team Lead
Sherburne, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Teacher, Grade Level Team Lead
Tapia, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Teacher, Grade Level Team Lead
Zoller, Leihgan	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Teacher, Grade Level Team Lead

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.

SIP development involved our stakeholders (School Leadership Team, PLC's and School Intervention Team). This input was used to identify the need to continue to improve a system to monitor the lowest 35%, ESSA support and improvement through data analysis, and selection of interventions.

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 SIP will be regularly monitored by:

The PLC Teams will use PLC Guiding Questions, problem solve for all levels of support using both district, state and CFA assessments, Create, monitor and refine action plans created.

The SIT will continue to develop and refine a system to monitor the lowest 35%, attendance, behavior and underperforming subgroups.

The SLT will Monitor and reflect on Learning Walk data that is conducted quarterly, Monitor Tier 1 assessment data school wide, Monitor school culture data and Monitor parent data surveys.

The school leadership team will use student progress monitoring, Walk Through Data, and ITC/Admin observations to make adjustments to ensure continuous improvement.

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	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	39	39	32	29	32	33	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	2	9	9	0	0	0	27
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	14	38	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	33	41	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	2	0	4	13	18	0	0	0	37

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	3	19	9	18	17	22	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	1	5	0	5	11	5	0	0	0	27
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	10	24	12	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	28	34	0	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	10	39	27	0	0	0	76
Course Failures ELA or Math	2	6	12	8	2	9	0	0	0	39

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	2	6	12	8	2	9	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	3	19	9	18	17	22	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	1	5	0	5	11	5	0	0	0	27
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	10	24	12	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	28	34	0	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	10	39	27	0	0	0	76
Course Failures ELA or Math	2	6	12	8	2	9	0	0	0	39

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	2	6	12	8	2	9	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	8
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*	46	47	53	63	52	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				58			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			35		
Math Achievement*	46	48	59	52	46	50	48		
Math Learning Gains				53			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			39		
Science Achievement*	40	50	54	40	50	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	70	61	59	76			50		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	431
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	27	Yes	2	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	31	Yes	2	1
HSP	52			
MUL	48			
PAC				

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%
WHT	50			
FRL	47			

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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	48			

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	46			46			40					70
SWD	25			16			20				4	
ELL	30			23			42				5	70
AMI												
ASN	73			82							2	
BLK	32			30			37				4	
HSP	47			40			40				5	68

| **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
MUL	61			35							2	
PAC												
WHT	45			51			39				4	
FRL	39			32			31				5	76

| **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	63	58	46	52	53	43	40					76
SWD	37	33	29	25	30	32	35					
ELL	39	48	36	41	59	33	24					76
AMI												
ASN	86			86								
BLK	37	48	46	32	48		25					
HSP	57	50	40	41	44	29	25					71
MUL	69	71		38	47		30					
PAC												
WHT	68	61	46	59	59	56	48					
FRL	53	54	42	40	48	40	31					79

| **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	59	49	35	48	40	39	47					50
SWD	32	38	18	29	29	33	41					
ELL	42	40		33	20		20					50
AMI												
ASN	83			58								
BLK	43	33		34	25		50					
HSP	52	43	31	33	33	45	39					55
MUL	55			55								
PAC												
WHT	63	55	38	56	47	33	51					

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
FRL	50	41	33	35	28	38	40					60

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	42%	51%	-9%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	48%	11%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	93%	54%	39%	54%	39%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	50%	1%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	54%	-11%	61%	-18%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	49%	-9%	51%	-11%

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.

Math scores for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades were all below the state proficiency averages.
3rd grade COES (51%) 3rd state (59%), 4th grade COES (43%) 4th state (61%), 5th grade COES (42%) 5th state (51%). Intermediate grades specialized instruction STEM/Humanities.

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

Behavior Referrals/Suspensions (referrals decreased by 56%) - Behavior System and Supports
Number of retained students decreased from 8 students previous year to only 2 students. MTSS- with strategic action planning and monitoring.

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.

4th grade Math scores: COES (43% proficiency) and 4th state (61% proficiency). Specialized instruction and several new teachers, with 1 teacher resigning during 2 quarter.

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

Our 3rd Grade ELA proficiency (59%) was above the state 3rd Grade ELA proficiency (50%)
Specialized instruction for students with large gaps of instruction. MTSS- with strategic action planning and monitoring.

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

5th Grade: ELA Level 1 scores increased
Attendance Concerns: 204 students (K-5) with 10% or more absences

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

Increase Parent Communication - Culture of collective responsibility
Math/ELA Focus K-5 - Intentional planning aligned to the standard/benchmark
ELA/Math 3-5 for Specialization - Intentional planning aligned to the standard/benchmark
Data Driven Decisions - Improved Academic & Behavior systems to analyze data.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Intentionally plan and deliver quality instruction aligned to the rigor of the standards that will increase student proficiency and growth. Including a targeted support system to analyze data and monitor student growth for all students but especially for the lowest 35% and the lowest performing subgroups: SWD and Blk.

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

Intentional planning using the core resources and alignment to the new standards. Increased data as seen in the instructional rounds. Student data improve over time and improved student engagement.

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

Walkthrough data using IPG tools, lesson plans, PLC work, CFA's, and Data (FAST, Renaissance and DIBELS) ITC/Admin will work through coaching cycles to reflect on the effectiveness of their instruction. Academic & Behavior Expectations and Recognition System.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Matthewson (kmatthew@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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

Use a school-wide system to analyze data to monitor growth, and teams engage in problem-solving processes to monitor effectiveness of core instruction and intervention supports.

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

Using District Initiatives/Expectations such as SLT & PLCsTeams: School Intervention Teams (SIT): Identify students needing intensive support, diagnose learning needs using a consistent problem-solving process, and design interventions to target missing universal skills.
Use data to identify and intervene with students needing Tier 2 support (academic & behavior)
Provide intensive Tier 3 supports, and monitor fidelity of Tier 3 interventions (academic & behavior)
Collaborate with teacher teams to monitor implementation of interventions plans and provide targeted support to students with gaps in learning.

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Increase staff, student and community engagement by strengthening a culture of collective responsibility.

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

Collaborative culture will continue to grow by action planning around Gallup and staff engagement will increase to at least 50%. SLT action planned around Gallup and student engagement will increase to at least 70%. Stronger Parent/Teacher relationships with increased participation in parent surveys.

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

Gallup (Student and Staff) and Staff /Parent Surveys

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Edwards (kdougher@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.)

Administration provides opportunities for staff to collaborate and use feedback for change -
A positive culture involves a school vision that should be aspirational yet attainable and focus on widely communicated goals of high performance. A vision should be easy to communicate and flexible enough to allow for experimentation. School-wide values are a way to frame your beliefs and shared assumptions.

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

For school collaborative cultures to be successful they must be supported by all three dimensions of a school's culture – shared beliefs and assumptions, norms and behaviors, and artifacts.

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.

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

Focus area for K-2 will be Foundational. Last year we were at 67% proficient in grade K and 69% proficient in grade 1. Our goal this year is 80% or higher. Not only just because it is a major goal of our system, but also because research and evidence tell us that students who cannot read at the end of 1st grade will continually struggle throughout their educational career.

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

3-5 focus area will be tier 2 and tier 3 students. Tier 3 provides intensive supports for individual students with more significant needs or whose needs are not sufficiently met by Tier 2 supports. Tier 2 supports will ensure a reteach in tier 1 skills.

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

We will be using the DIBELS screeners that are given 3 times a year through the district. See previous page for data in grades k/1. We had over 50% of students on track.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Outcomes will be our subgroups are making substantial progress in tier 2/3. Grade 4 according to FAST had 27% in level 1 and 26% in level 2 while grade 5 had 27% in level 1 and 31% in level 2. We will be able to see these gains in both Module assessments and FAST data.

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.

Monitoring will occur monthly with all grade levels. A schedule has been completed to meet with grade levels on tier 2 and tier 3 . A protocol has been created to ensure the teachers are following the correct procedures. In addition, coaches and admin conduct weekly walkthroughs to evaluate these times.

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

Edwards, Kelly, kdougher@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?

Evidence Based Program being used in 3-5- SIPPS- (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) program. This is approved by the district for a Tier 3 intervention. Tier 2 will be reteach of core instruction.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Approved by the District School Board of Pasco County for tier 3 interventions on the Decision Making Tree.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching- ELA coach has given coaching in SIPPS practice. Coach also gives coaching in PLC in relation to tier 1/tier 2 practices based off of module data.	Edwards, Kelly, kdougher@pasco.k12.fl.us
Monitoring and Feedback- Admin and Coaches- monthly- Tier 2/tier 3	Edwards, Kelly, kdougher@pasco.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

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

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

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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))

N/A

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

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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes