San Antonio Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

San Antonio Elementary School

32416 DARBY RD, Dade City, FL 33525

https://saes.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.

San Antonio Elementary Cambridge Magnet School will provide a rigorous and enriched education with high expectations for all students in a safe, positive, and motivating environment while celebrating the diversity and uniqueness of our student population.

Provide the school's vision statement.

San Antonio Elementary Cambridge Magnet School will develop learners who are responsible, innovative, confident, engaged, and reflective. Our students will be equipped for a successful future in college, career, and life!

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Anderson, Kim	Principal	School leader - Principal
Bos, Haylei	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of 5th grade Mathematics and Science.
Caballero, Leah	Teacher, ESE	Special Education Teacher and Team Leader
Crumpler, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Teacher and Team Leader
Denaro, Donna	Teacher, K-12	5th grade teacher and Team Leader
Morris, Elicia	Instructional Coach	2nd grade teacher and Humanities Coach
Plourde, Peg	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade STEM teacher and Team Leader
Rudolph, Sarah	Math Coach	2nd Grade Teacher and STEM Coach
Walter, Ona	Teacher, K-12	Lead Tutor

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.

Leadership team, teachers, and staff-- surveys, discussions, meetings, and data reviews
Parents - SAC meetings and parent surveys
Students and student leadership team (NEHS)- surveys, discussions, meetings
Business Partners and community leaders - SAC meetings and individual questionnaires

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 monitored through data chats with the SIT and SLT teams. The school will revise that plan if two or more data chats identify that the strategies outlined in the plan are showing no growth or a decline in academic performance.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B
	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	41	31	32	33	31	19	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	6	5	7	17	17	10	0	0	0	62
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	5	19	10	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	26	11	0	0	0	42
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	

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	2	3	3	8	19	9	0	0	0	44

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	2	1	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	10
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	17	25	22	19	17	31	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	5	5	13	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	3	1	0	8	1	1	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	23	2	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	10	44	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	10	61	0	0	0	103
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	21	10	44	0	0	0	75

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	12	7	10	7	10	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	12
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	17	25	22	19	17	31	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	5	5	13	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	3	1	0	8	1	1	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	23	2	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	10	44	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	10	61	0	0	0	103
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	21	10	44	0	0	0	75

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	12	7	10	7	10	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	12
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*	47	47	53	53	52	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				54			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			48		
Math Achievement*	55	48	59	49	46	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				50			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			39		
Science Achievement*	57	50	54	42	50	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	47	61	59	58			28		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	255
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
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	20	Yes	4	4
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	47			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	55			

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%
FRL	43			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	35	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	2	1
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	45			

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	47			55			57					47
SWD	17			23							3	
ELL	40			40							3	47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			45							2	
HSP	39			47		46					5	45
MUL	60			47							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	49			60			60				4	
FRL	39			43			43				5	47

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	53	54	51	49	50	40	42					58
SWD	27	43	33	27	30	17	13					
ELL	29	47		24	41		8					58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			33								
HSP	41	56	47	33	38	25	21					47
MUL	90			50								
PAC												
WHT	57	55	56	57	56	50	52					
FRL	43	50	51	40	47	41	36					53

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	52	44	48	50	42	39	46					28
SWD	23	25	25	27	42	45	8					
ELL	16			28								28
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			27								
HSP	33	35		29	41		47					31
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	45	60	58	40	15	46					
FRL	41	37	46	37	43	46	38					27

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	50%	51%	-1%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	55%	-2%	58%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	96%	54%	42%	54%	42%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	59%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	54%	-16%	61%	-23%
05	2023 - Spring	59%	52%	7%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	49%	7%	51%	5%

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 science data was our lowest-performing area. The 5th grade team was not a stable as we would have liked.

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

Our science data showed the greatest decline. The 5th grade team was not a stable as we would have liked.

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.

This data is not available

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

ELA Learning gains had an increase of 10%. We adopted a new curriculum, everyone was trained in that curriculum and we departmentalized teachers in grades 3-5.

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

Level ones in 4th-grade math are alarming. The number of students with greater than 10% absence rate is also alarming.

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

Level ones in math.
Level ones in ELA.
Attendance school-wide.

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

SAES SWD, black, ELL, and Hispanic subgroups consistently score below 41% proficient in ELA and Math. Based upon our FAST data from the 2022-2023 year, students are not increasing in academic proficiency as we would hope throughout the duration of the year. By strategically setting up and maintaining our academic and behavioral small groups, we hope to better support students toward achieving proficiency in ELA and Math

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

A 10% increase in the number of all subgroup students demonstrating learning gains in ELA and Math.

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

We will use FAST assessments as well as HMH monitoring tools, SIPPS, and UFLI to progress monitor students as they move through the school year. The SIT team will review this data on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elicia Morris (ecmorris@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.)

HMH ELA curriculum, SIPPS and UFLI. Eureka assessments

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

These are all state-approved resources with a proven track record of success.

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.

Train all teachers using UFLI
Train all teachers using SIPPS
Monitor data in SIT meetings

Person Responsible: Kim Anderson (kaanders@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly throughout the year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment 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.

While there has been a decrease in student discipline incidences, it is still an area that we wish to monitor closely. Our primary concern is the small group of students who receive repeated discipline referrals and suspensions. A secondary concern of ours is the need for students to be able to understand their feelings and manage their actions. We will continue to support students with this through Resiliency training time during morning meetings. This work ties in with the third area of focus mentioned above in "Culture and Environment". It has been determined that stronger stakeholder (students, families, and staff) engagement would strengthen a number of areas that lead to student progress including improved attendance, resiliency learning, decreased discipline instances, and so on.

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

A 5% increase in student, parent, and staff engagement.

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

This will be monitored through EWS and the Gallup survey as well as walk-throughs and SBIT notes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Anderson (kaanders@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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

Use of Morning Meetings for teaching resiliency strategies.

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

This has been chosen as an extension of the work we have begun with resiliency standards.

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.

Training of all staff on resiliency standards.
Monitoring of lesson plans for standards
Monitoring of Morning meeting time with a walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible: Kim Anderson (kaanders@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly in SIT meetings.

#3. 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.

Based upon the required implementation of the ELA standards, teachers will need to be proficient in both understanding and execution of these standards in their instruction in order to improve ELA scores from the beginning of the year to the end.

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

A 10% increase in the number of students in a cohort scoring proficient (70%+) in ELA, using FAST/ STAR. Monitoring will be from EOY to EOY in grade levels 1 and 2. Kindergarten will be BOY to EOY using STAR.

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

We will use FAST and DIBELS to assist us in monitoring from BOY to EOY in all grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Anderson (kaanders@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.)

We will be using the districtwide ELA curriculum MMH in all classrooms to address the B.E.S.T Standards.

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

Due to the requirement of districtwide implementation, we will use this curriculum to assist us in meeting the ELA instructional needs of our students as we teach to the B.E.S.T standards.

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 staff will monitor progress toward mastery of B.E.S.T. standards in ELA through end-of-module tests and FAST tests.

Person Responsible: Kim Anderson (kaanders@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly in SIT team meetings

Instructional staff will deliberately construct tiers of support based upon assessments to guide students to mastery of the B.E.S.T Standards.

Person Responsible: Kim Anderson (kaanders@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: By the end of quarter 1.

Teachers will implement global perspectives in all classes for all students. Training will occur to support this process throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Kim Anderson (kaanders@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year.

PLC's meet every third week with the leadership team during planning. They will reflect on standards-based common assessments and develop an action plan for improvement.

Person Responsible: Kim Anderson (kaanders@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year.

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

Based upon the required implementation of the ELA standards, teachers will need to be proficient in both understanding and execution of these standards in their instruction in order to improve ELA scores from the beginning of the year to the end. Teachers will implement the district/state-approved curriculum with fidelity with a focus on foundational skills.

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

Based upon the required implementation of the ELA standards, teachers will need to be proficient in both understanding and execution of these standards in their instruction in order to improve ELA scores from the beginning of the year to the end. Teachers will implement the district/state-approved curriculum with fidelity with a focus on foundational skills and comprehension.

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

A 10% increase in the number of students in a cohort scoring proficient (70%+) in ELA, using FAST/STAR. Monitoring will be from EOY to EOY in grade levels 1 and 2. Kindergarten will be BOY to EOY using STAR.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

A 10% increase in the number of students in a cohort scoring proficient (70%+) in ELA, using FAST. Monitoring will be from EOY to EOY in all grade levels.

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.

We will use FAST and DIBELS to assist us in monitoring from BOY to EOY in all grade levels.

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

Anderson, Kim, kaanders@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?

HMH
Heggerty
UFLI
SIPPS
All programs meet Florida's evidence-based definition, and the district's K-12 Reading Plan, and align to the BEST standards.

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?

The school district selected these programs through a thorough materials selection process.

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
Train all K-2 teachers on the UFLI Curriculum. Train all intervention teachers on the SIPPS Program	Morris, Elicia, ecmorris@pasco.k12.fl.us
Create a Walk through plan to monitor the us eof the programs	Anderson, Kim, kaanders@pasco.k12.fl.us
Create a lesson Plan Calendar to follow the Rainbow Map	Morris, Elicia, ecmorris@pasco.k12.fl.us
Create a PLC Calendar	Anderson, Kim, kaanders@pasco.k12.fl.us