Cotee River Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cotee River Elementary School

7515 PLATHE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34653

https://cres.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.

We are dedicated to creating life-long learners through high expectations and a safe learning environment. We believe all children can learn and will ensure all students reach their academic, social and developmental potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All our students achieving success in college, career, and life.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Slusser, Sharon	Principal	
Orndorff, Andrea	Assistant Principal	
Just, Julie	Instructional Coach	ELA Integration of S. Studies and Science KG-5th , Cooperative Structures The goal of the school-based coach is to support classroom teachers and principals by focusing work directly on improving instruction as the primary avenue to improve student outcomes. In addition to content-focused mentoring, coaches support professional development of skills in critical areas such as establishing a positive classroom climate, implementing instructional and intervention strategies for all students including English Language Learners and students with disabilities, supporting classroom management, analyzing student work, and differentiating instruction. Instructional Coaches' Tasks: Relationship building, Impact Cycle, Leading PD with follow up through learning in action (alignment to school success plan), Implementation support, Mentoring, PLC support based on content areas, Learning Walkthroughs, Professional knowledge learning, Supporting teams with standards based planning, Assessments
Loveless, Steve	Instructional Coach	The goal of the school-based coach is to support classroom teachers and principals by focusing work directly on improving instruction as the primary avenue to improve student outcomes. In addition to content-focused mentoring, coaches support professional development of skills in critical areas such as establishing a positive classroom climate, implementing instructional and intervention strategies for all students including English Language Learners and students with disabilities, supporting classroom management, analyzing student work, and differentiating instruction. Instructional Coaches' Tasks: Relationship building, Impact Cycle, Leading PD with follow up through learning in action (alignment to school success plan), Implementation support, Mentoring, PLC support based on content areas, Learning Walkthroughs, Professional knowledge learning, Supporting teams with standards based planning, Assessments

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.

Continuous Improvement Process that occurs year around:
- February begin Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA): This includes utilizing student data (Performance Data: achievement, learning gains, low 25 learning gains, subgroups and EWS Data); stakeholder feedback (Parent Input:Focus Groups and Surveys, Staff Gallup, 5th grade Student Gallup and self-assessment (LLT/STEM Committee outcomes, in house/district walkthrough trends, formal evaluations, BPIE, RtI at Work Survey and PLC Rubrics)
- March begin district site visits to support CNA process and quarter 3 data monitoring

- April draft Success Plan and Title 1 planning (input from SAC)
- May-July end of year review to make any additional edits to success plan based on EOY data outcomes
- August meet with district to discuss SIP and plan for implementation and monitoring of plan
- September-December analyzing data, identifying trends and determine tier level of needs in order to see increase in student achievement from PM1 to PM2
- January engage in mid-year SIP reflection

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))

- Grade Level PLCs: On-going data (ex. CFAs, module assessments), along with BOY/MOY/EOY mandated assessments) disaggregation, problem-solving, developing action plans that include monitoring of implementation and outcomes and then updating as needed in order to meet SIP goals.
- School Based Leadership Team: Monthly and end of quarter SLT reflects on current data points (Tier 1 and 2 trends) and team action plans to determine next steps and how monitoring and feedback will be provided
- School Intervention Team (SIT): Monthly reflection on Tier 3 data (focus on response to intervention and next steps to continue closing unfinished learning and/or exit due to growth). This also includes monthly discussions with grade level PLCs (watchlist aligned with implementation plans)

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	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	85%
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) 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	9	26	27	38	32	26	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	3	13	11	15	14	0	0	0	56
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	0	16	34	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	38	0	0	0	54
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	0	2	5	8	15	24	0	0	0	54

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	0	1	9	2	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	25	20	24	13	35	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	6	7	1	5	7	11	0	0	0	37
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	42	36	23	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	45	36	36	0	0	0	117
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	19	13	24	8	10	0	0	0	74
Courses Failed ELA or Math	0	4	3	9	7	10	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA or Math	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	16	5	15	9	16	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	2	25	20	24	13	35	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	6	7	1	5	7	11	0	0	0	37
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	42	36	23	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	45	36	36	0	0	0	117
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	19	13	24	8	10	0	0	0	74
Courses Failed ELA or Math	0	4	3	9	7	10	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA or Math	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	16	5	15	9	16	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
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*	43	47	53	45	52	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				51			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			55		
Math Achievement*	42	48	59	46	46	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				60			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			33		
Science Achievement*	50	50	54	40	50	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	7	61	59	64			30		

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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	178
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	18	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	2	1
HSP	31	Yes	1	1
MUL	34	Yes	1	
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	52			
FRL	34	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%
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	43			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	47			

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	43			42			50					7
SWD	41			42			58				4	
ELL	24			24							3	7
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			28							2	
HSP	33			33			29				4	

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	39			29							2	
PAC												
WHT	49			49			65				4	
FRL	41			39			47				5	8

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	45	51	53	46	60	49	40					64
SWD	36	48	42	37	44	37	32					
ELL	37	73		33	71		40					64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	53		17	47							
HSP	33	58	50	36	60	40	22					
MUL	28	36		39	73							
PAC												
WHT	55	48	43	57	60	56	50					
FRL	42	53	52	43	60	47	34					

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	47	45	55	43	42	33	45					30
SWD	37	41	43	36	33	21	37					
ELL	35			45								30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			32								
HSP	43	57		37	36		75					
MUL	38			48								
PAC												
WHT	49	43	63	45	44	44	36					

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	44	43	60	40	37	31	44					

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	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	48%	-17%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	29%	50%	-21%	59%	-30%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	54%	-16%	61%	-23%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	49%	-11%	51%	-13%

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.

3rd grade ELA (32% proficiency) and growth between PM1 and PM3 (19%)

3rd grade Math (29% proficiency) and growth between PM1 and PM3 (27%)

Contributing Factors for ELA and Math proficiency: Increase understanding of standards and how they are stacked in ELA, instructional consistency in classroom without a certified teacher and attendance issues where children are missing instruction.

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

3rd grade ELA (32% proficiency) and growth between PM1 and PM3 (19%)

3rd grade Math (29% proficiency) and growth between PM1 and PM3 (27%)

Contributing Factors for ELA and Math proficiency: Increase understanding of standards and how they are stacked in ELA, instructional consistency in classroom without a certified teacher and attendance issues where children are missing instruction.

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.

CRES ELA 3rd:32 (18% lower), 4th:51 (6% lower), 5th:41 (14% lower)
State ELA 3rd:50, 4th:57, 5th:55

CRES Math 3rd:29 (30% lower), 4th:38 (23% lower), 5th:51 (4% lower)
State Math 3rd:59, 4th:61, 5th:55

Contributing Factors for ELA and Math proficiency: Increase understanding of standards and how they are stacked in ELA, instructional consistency in classroom without a certified teacher and attendance issues where children are missing instruction.

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

4th grade ELA (51% proficiency) and growth between PM1 and PM3 (29%)
4th grade Math (38% proficiency) and growth between PM1 and PM3 (38%)

5th grade ELA (41% proficiency) and growth between PM1 and PM3 (29%)
5th grade Math (53% proficiency) and growth between PM1 and PM3 (51%)

At MOY SuP reflection (January 2023) reviewed projected data and revisited our Tier 2 and 3 action plan for the children identified as needing additional support or extension for ELA and Math (Grades K-5). In addition to revising Tier level of supports action plans, in Math implemented 50/50 model utilizing ZEARN to align with the daily instruction provided by the teacher for Tier 1 and also used to support additional Tier levels of support. In addition, increased focus on targeting DI needs during Literacy and Math Instructional Framework. In math added Accelerated Math opportunities for 3rd and 4th grade children.

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

- Attendance
- Suspension Referrals

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

-High Impact Instruction: PLCs will intentionally plan instruction, while utilizing the four guiding principles, to ensure there are opportunities for students to engage in grade appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement and for all students to be held to high expectations. (Increase proficiency in ELA and Math for grades 3rd-5th)
- Collaborative Culture: Promote personal growth and sense of community and belonging, in a compassionate school culture and collective responsibility.
-Data Driven Decisions: Build challenging educational systematic and equitable learning experiences so that all scholars achieve through the tier level of supports. (Increase proficiency for subgroups (Black, Students with Disabilities) that did not meet the 41% criteria: Currently identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement

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

#1. 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.

EWS data and the number of referrals:
Promote personal growth and sense of community and belonging, in a compassionate school culture and collective responsibility.

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

The number of discipline referrals will decrease by 10%

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

• Walkthroughs conducted by SWAT (CD Look-Fors and PBIS Walkthrough Tool)
• EWS Data
• Monthly CDAT Committee to Review Tier 1 Data
• Monthly SIT (MTSS and SWAT) Data Chats to Review Tier 3 scholar interventions and response to interventions according to data collected
• PBIS Rewards Application

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Slusser (ssacco@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.)

District Wide Resiliency Curriculum (aligned to standards)

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

Research Based Curriculum that will allow for consistency across grade levels and is in alignment with grade level standards/benchmarks

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.

- Social emotional learning structures that allow for all stakeholders to feel safe and cared for
- Implementation of resiliency curriculum
- Implementation of Conscious Discipline Structures School Wide
- Implementation of Cooperative Structures

Person Responsible: Sharon Slusser (ssacco@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation begins in August and continues throughout school year, along with monitoring.

#2. 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.

One or more grade levels (3rd and 5th) scored below the 50% proficiency in ELA for PM3 FAST Assessment. In addition, two of our subgroups (Black and SWD) did not meet the 41% criteria for one year (2022).

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

In ELA increase to 48% of the scholars (3rd and 5th) will be proficient on the PM3 FAST Assessment.
In ELA, 70% of the scholars will have a DIBELs composite score of 70% or higher K-5. Both our Black and SWD subgroup will increase to 41% or higher.

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

• Assessments: FAST, CFAs, Modules, DIBELs (BOY/MOY/EOY Progress Monitoring Data Checks), Intervention/Enrichment block data collection and progress monitoring in order to determine response to intervention
• Classroom Learning Walks conducted with LLT Committee: (IPG Tool, Literacy Framework)
• Grade Level PLCs Develop Action Plans in Response to Data (Grade Level Data Protocols)
• Quarterly SLT Data Chats to review and respond to Tier 1/2 Instructional Trends/Data
• PLC Agendas/Minutes

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Sharon Slusser (ssacco@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.)

Science of Reading (knowledge building and application through instructional practices)
Instructional planning around BEST standards for ELA and understanding the stacking of standards
Building Topic knowledge
DI/scaffolding that allows all scholars to access grade level standards

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

Foundations of Reading:
Instruction in Foundation Skills, Language and Morphology
Building Knowledge and Vocabulary Through Texts
Reading Critically to Deepen Understanding of Complex Text
Writing and Speaking to Develop Ideas and Communicate Text-Based Knowledge

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.

Consistent opportunities to work on Grade-Appropriate Assignments
o Teachers will engage in unit planning, with Instructional Coaches, that aligns scholar learning, tasks and outcomes with the complexity of the grade level BEST standards.
o Scholars will engage in explicit and systematic instruction and practice in foundational skills and vocabulary.
o Intentionally plan and pose high-quality questions to build knowledge and require evidence to support their ideas
o Backwards planning of Performance Task when unpacking benchmarks (text, topic, tool to support application in task)

Strong Instruction, where students do most of the thinking in a lesson
o Scholars engage in reasoning, problem solving and justifying their thinking while working through challenging tasks

Deep Engagement in what they're learning
o Scholars will engage in cooperative structures

Teachers who hold High Expectations for students and believe they can meet grade-level standards
o Provide differentiated instruction, through tiered level of supports

Person Responsible: Sharon Slusser (ssacco@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation begins in August and continues throughout school year, along with monitoring: On-going through PLCs and Committee work

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

One or more grade levels scored below the 50% proficiency (3rd and 4th) during PM3 FAST Assessment.
In Math, 48% of the scholars will be proficient on the PM3 FAST Assessment.

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

In Math, 48% of the scholars (3rd and 4th) will be proficient on the PM3 FAST Assessment.

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

• Assessments: FAST, CFAs, Modules
• Classroom Learning Walks conducted with STEM Committee: (IPG Tool and Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards Classroom Look-Fors)
• Grade Level PLCs Develop Action Plans in Response to Data (Grade Level Data Protocols)
• Quarterly SLT Data Chats to review and respond to Tier 1 Instructional Trends/Data
• PLC Agendas/Minutes

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Slusser (ssacco@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.)

Implementation of Differentiated Strategies and Cooperative Structures

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

Increases the opportunity for all students to access grade level curriculum and engage in grade level tasks/activities.

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.

Consistent opportunities to work on Grade-Appropriate Assignments
o Teachers will engage in unit planning, with Instructional Coaches, that aligns scholar learning, tasks and outcomes with the complexity of the grade level BEST standards.
o Intentionally plan and pose high-quality questions to build knowledge and require evidence

Strong Instruction, where students do most of the thinking in a lesson
o Scholars engage in reasoning, problem solving and justifying their thinking
o Scholars utilize a digital platform to support and enhance their growth.

Deep Engagement in what they're learning
o Scholars will engage in cooperative structures that creates conditions for scholars to talk and ask questions about other's thinking, in order to clarify or improve understanding.

Teachers who hold High Expectations for students and believe they can meet grade-level standards
o Provide differentiated instruction, through tiered level of supports, in order for all scholars to access, reach or enrich grade level standards.

Person Responsible: Sharon Slusser (ssacco@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation begins in August and continues throughout school year, along with monitoring: On-going through PLCs and Committee work

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

Reading of Science: Decoding (D) x Language Comprehension (LC) = Reading Comprehension (RC)
Prioritize literacy as the foundation for all learning
Instruction in Foundation Skills, Language and Morphology
Building Knowledge and Vocabulary Through Texts
Writing and Speaking to Develop Ideas and Communicate Text-Based Knowledge
- Implement rigorous curriculum within a coherent literacy framework
- Instructional planning around BEST standards for ELA (understand stacking of standards)
- DI/scaffolding that allows all scholars to access grade level standards - Identify children requiring interventions and develop an action plan

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

Science of Reading (knowledge building and application through instructional practices Instruction in Foundation Skills, Language and Morphology
Building Knowledge and Vocabulary Through Texts
Reading Critically to Deepen Understanding of Complex Text
Writing and Speaking to Develop Ideas and Communicate Text-Based Knowledge
- Implement rigorous curriculum within a coherent literacy framework
- Instructional planning around BEST standards for ELA (understand stacking of standards)
- DI/scaffolding that allows all scholars to access grade level standards - Identify children requiring interventions and develop an action plan

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

Utilizing DIBELs data, 70% or more of our children in grades KG-2nd will meet the required criteria by the end of the 23-24 school year. Utilizing the Renaissance Learning platform 70% or more of the children in grades KG-1st will meet proficiency by the end of the 23-24 school year and 2nd grade 60%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Utilizing DIBELs data, 70% or more of our children in grades 3rd-5th will meet their fluency and MAZE criteria by the end of the 23-24 school year. Utilizing the Cambium Assessment platform 50% or more of the children in grades 3rd-5th will meet proficiency by the end of the 23-24 school year.

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.

BOY/MOY/EOY Progress Monitoring Data Checks for Tier 1; more frequent progress monitoring checks for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups in order to determine RtI (tool utilized and how often) and edit groupings and action plans as needed

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

Slusser, Sharon, ssacco@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?

- Foundational Skills: Explicit, systematic practice with foundational skills in the early grades.
- Complexity: Regular practice with complex text and it's academic language
- Knowledge: Building Knowledge and vocabulary through text
- Evidenced based: Reading, writing, and speaking grounded in evidence from text, both literary and informational
- Curriculum:Utilize HMH as an Instructional Resource

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?

- Strong reading comprehension cannot occur unless both decoding skills and language comprehension abilities are strong.
- Teach children to decode expertly as early as possible. When children can decode expertly, their reading comprehension capabilities equal their language comprehension abilities.
- Providing children with strong content knowledge in many domains at all grade levels will assist them in developing adequate language comprehension abilities.
- Intervention for struggling readers is effective only when it targets the child's specific needs, which may be decoding, language comprehension, or both.
- Struggling readers of all ages can have decoding weaknesses; explicit instruction in decoding will be necessary to improve their reading comprehension.
- Digging deeper into the BEST standards and knowing the vertical progression of foundations benchmarks will assist in planning for scaffolding needs in order to engage all children in grade levels texts and tasks.

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
- Assessment: Digging deeper into our progress monitoring tools in order to better utilize when identifying targeted areas of need (DIBELs and state assessment platform) - Literacy Leadership: Continue work within Lead Literacy Team/Committee (LLT)	Slusser, Sharon, ssacco@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.

- Description of how your SIP and Title 1 Plan is shared with stakeholders throughout the year: SAC meetings, Parent Focus Group, Title 1 Annual Meeting, PLCs and Staff meetings
- Description of how SIP progress is shared using parent friendly language: SAC,PLCs and Staff Meetings
- School webpage: wwww.cres.pasco.k12.fl.us

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))

- School webpage: wwww.cres.pasco.k12.fl.us
- Teachers will engage with families by sharing current curriculum, assessments and their child's academic growth. Through a partnership, goals can be set for their educational journey. Conferences utilized to provide information.
- Kindergarten student transition event, Carline conversations; All Pro Dads, Family and community outreach events (campus cleanup, special Olympics/unified partners, hunger walk, relay for life, student council projects); School wide events (Winter Festival, Spring Festival, concerts, award ceremonies and

celebrations)Bring your parent to school activities (Each semester)
- Monthly Newsletter with Tips

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))

- Daily Intervention/Enrichment Block (Additional ELA instruction based on student data and aligned to tiered level of supports)
- Accelerated Math Program 3rd-5th
- Gifted Inclusion 2nd-5th
- ESY programs offered

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))

Federal program directors meet quarterly in collaboration meetings to discuss programs across the various funding sources to reduce duplication of efforts and increase efficiency of federal funds.