

Pasco County Schools

# Schrader Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>26</b>

## Schrader Elementary School

11041 LITTLE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

<https://ses.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.**

Schrader Elementary: A compassionate culture with high expectations and unlimited possibilities for all.  
Every Raider, Every Day!

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

All of 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
Keith, Lee Anne	Principal	Assessments, Scheduling, PMP Process, 504s, Behavior, Primary staff evaluations, Coaching cycle with teachers, PLC planning, SBIT Team, Safety and Security, Hiring process, Classroom observations and walkthroughs, Data analysis meetings, Budget, Parent partnerships, community outreach
Peterson, Sara	Assistant Principal	Assessments, Scheduling, PMP Process, 504s, Behavior, Primary staff evaluations, Coaching cycle with teachers, PLC planning, SBIT Team, Safety and Security, Hiring process, Classroom observations and walkthroughs, Data analysis meetings, Budget, Parent partnerships, community outreach, Assessment Coordinator
Mularz, Shana	Instructional Coach	Oversees MTSS, PLCs, Planning, Data Collection, PMP process, Coaching cycle with teachers, Data meetings, TBITs, Classroom walkthroughs
Lines, Mariana	Teacher, ESE	ESE Chair, compliance, IEP, Data collections, Pre-K and 5th Articulation for ESE students
Donley, Kristina	Behavior Specialist	Provides Tier 1 coaching to teachers, Tier 2 behavioral supports, CICO, Social Skills groups, PBIS Chairperson, Tier 3 BIP/FBA
Alderman, Christa	Teacher, K-12	Leader of grade 5, leads PLCs, Data analysis, MTSS schedules, team field trips, and planning for success.
Hopper, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Leader of grade K, leads PLCs, Data analysis, MTSS schedules, team field trips, planning for success.
	Instructional Coach	Oversees MTSS, PLCs, Planning, Data Collection, PMP process, Coaching cycle with teachers, Data meetings, TBITs, Classroom walkthroughs

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our School Advisory Council is an active part of our SIP development. Our teams include parents, teachers, leadership members, business partners, parent and community involvement personnel, and other staff members. When we come together as a Leadership Team to develop goals for the school year, we also bring them to SAC. We share all of our data with them and the development of goals to ensure we continue to collaborate with all stakeholders. In Spring, when we bring the data and share our goals, we also ask for SAC input. Our Comprehensive Needs Assessment is the central foundation of our work at Schrader. All of the CNA work is transferred to our SIP.

**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))

To address the needs of our underperforming subgroups and ensure continuous improvement, we have a variety of structures in place. Schrader has a non-negotiable SWAT time (Students Will Always Triumph) for all grade levels. During this time, teachers, instructional assistants, support facilitators, academic tutors, and our interventionists support Tier 2/3 skills and standards to help close gaps. This occurs 30 minutes daily. Teams meet regularly with coaches to restructure groups based on the data and the needs of the students. To support the data of this work, we also meet every three weeks as a leadership team with team leaders and support facilitators to discuss data and see if kids are making progress. Teams are responsible for their MTSS tracking binder with all their CFAs and other important information.

Another structure we have in place is Monitoring for Achievement Days. These days occur three times a year with all team members. We review data and set goals with an action plan for the upcoming Progress Monitoring cycle. These days are dedicated to looking at all students and all subgroups to determine the needs of all students. Once action plans are set, administration and coaches support teachers with their new plans through PLCs, walkthroughs, coaching cycles, and TBIT/SBIT meetings weekly.

Throughout the year, we will use our SIP to closely monitor our goals and reflect on the progress that is being made.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	42%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	84%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)



<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## 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	31	41	30	36	22	26	0	0	0	186	
One or more suspensions	4	7	2	6	7	5	0	0	0	31	
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	41	35	35	0	0	0	111	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	54	40	40	0	0	0	134	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	41	35	35	0	0	0	111	

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	1	2	8	11	17	0	0	0	41

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	1	2	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	22
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	59	44	47	44	33	31	0	0	0	258	
One or more suspensions	8	9	4	17	0	7	0	0	0	45	
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	38	29	23	0	0	0	90	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	46	32	43	0	0	0	121	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	39	24	31	38	29	23	0	0	0	184	

**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	4	17	11	15	11	11	0	0	0	69

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	59	44	47	44	33	31	0	0	0	258	
One or more suspensions	8	9	4	17	0	7	0	0	0	45	
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	38	29	23	0	0	0	90	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	46	32	43	0	0	0	121	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	39	24	31	38	29	23	0	0	0	184	

**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	4	17	11	15	11	11	0	0	0	69

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	13
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*	33	47	53	40	52	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				58			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			55		
Math Achievement*	33	48	59	39	46	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				46			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			29		
Science Achievement*	26	50	54	34	50	59	35		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	61	59	45			47		

\* 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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	184
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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	351
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	5	Yes	2	2
ELL	31	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	23	Yes	2	2
HSP	32	Yes	2	
MUL	19	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	1	

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	36	Yes	1	

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	20	Yes	1	1
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	36	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	43			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	33			33			26					55
SWD	7			7			0				4	
ELL	19			19							3	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20			32							3	
HSP	29			24			17				5	53
MUL	24			24							3	

## 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	37			37			31				4	
FRL	31			31			25				5	57

## 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	40	58	46	39	46	43	34					45
SWD	13	41	43	20	43	33	10					
ELL	39	56		22	40		25					45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			11								
HSP	41	47	29	34	45	40	33					42
MUL	36			36								
PAC												
WHT	42	62	57	44	44	39	33					
FRL	40	56	44	37	46	44	35					39

## 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	37	39	55	39	42	29	35					47
SWD	16	50	64	24	27		26					
ELL	42			25								47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			8								
HSP	40	53		34	56		56					47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	36	38	50	45	39	25	33					
FRL	33	42	69	35	41	31	33					50

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	51%	-15%	54%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	55%	-21%	58%	-24%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	48%	-14%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	30%	50%	-20%	59%	-29%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	54%	-14%	61%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	28%	52%	-24%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	27%	49%	-22%	51%	-24%

### 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.**

The lowest performing area of the 22-23 school year was 5th-grade science, with an overall proficiency score of 27%. In years past, we have had a STEM Lab that students have gone to as a rotation to help strengthen the overall science instruction. Due to budget cuts, this lab was not active this past year. Also, we did a triad in 5th grade this year, and one teacher was responsible for the science instruction and all interventions. This coming year, we will return to a specialized set-up where two teachers are doing the STEM block. It will allow the teachers to plan together and dive deeper into the science instruction and curriculum. Another trend we noticed was that other grades weren't teaching to the depth of the science instruction. Teachers felt that the curriculum wasn't strong enough and didn't understand

the true outline the district had created. Through PD and planning, teachers have been able to strengthen this area. It will be the expectation that science is in daily instruction for at least 30 minutes.

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

From the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 school year, we saw the most significant dip in 3rd-grade mathematics. We went from 40% proficient to 30%. This year we had some teachers new to the grade level, specifically STEM. There is a big emphasis on ELA in 3rd grade, so the math planning and interventions weren't as strong as the ELA side. Our SWAT time is dedicated to a lot of Tier 2 and Tier 3 ELA work. This upcoming year, we will put a plan in place to have more math interventions to help close these gaps and raise student achievement.

**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.**

Compared with the state, our most significant gap was 3rd-grade math, with 5th-grade math closely behind it. 3rd-grade math had a 29-point difference, and 5th-grade math had a 27-point difference. As mentioned above, there hasn't been the biggest focus on mathematics intervention within our SWAT time. We've also had new teachers in these grade levels that weren't as familiar with the curriculum. We have restructured teams and will bring math interventions into the mathematics block.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was 4th-grade mathematics. The overall proficiency went from 35%-39%. One action this team took early in the school year was adding math intervention to their SWAT time. This was the only grade level that consistently used math interventions.

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

One of the most extensive areas of concern is our Level 1's on our statewide assessments. That will be a major focus in the 23-24 school year. We need to get those learning gaps filled and strive for higher proficiencies. We have some vital goals for the new school year to help leverage these weaker areas. Support from the district will be a priority for us this year to dive into more intentional planning. With the right planning and rigor, we can achieve the goals set forth. Our ELA Academic Tutor will have a laser focus on our retained 3rd grade students and 4th grade students who were promoted with Good Cause.

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

1. ELA Planning
2. Math Tier 2 and 3 interventions
3. Science Instruction
4. Writing Instruction
5. Learning gains of ELL and ESE subgroups

**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.

Our school is currently implementing Kagan Strategies this year. This engaging program helps focus on true collaboration amongst peers while building relationships. Infusing various strategies not only helps academics but enhances the overall positive culture and environment in each classroom.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our Collaborative Culture goal is focused on our Gallup survey for our students. We would like to see our overall "Hope" increase by at least 5% in the 23-24 survey results.

**Monitoring:**

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

During our monthly Early Release Days, we will be implementing a new school-wide Kagan strategy to focus on. During the month, administration, coaches, and district support personnel will conduct walkthroughs to ensure Kagan is implemented in all classrooms.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lee Anne Keith (lyerkey@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.)

- Kagan Strategies/monthly focus
- Conscious Discipline
- Core Actions with IPG Tool

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We truly feel to increase proficiency levels, it is crucial to have a positive environment with strong relationships. Kagan is an evidence-based intervention that has shown that students can build positive relationships with one another and close foundational gaps.

**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.

All teachers will need to engage in Kagan strategies actively to help not only improve the positive culture in all rooms but increase proficiencies.

**Person Responsible:** Lee Anne Keith (lyerkey@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** By the end of Quarter 1, all teachers will be consistently infusing Kagan into their academics.

**#2. 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.

Based on our learning gains, many structures are in place to support the learning of all students. To strengthen our practices and improve data, we need to shift our focus in both ELA and Math on the benchmark first with the support of the resource. This can be done with standards planning and PLC work. Changes that will be implemented will happen in the cycle of PLC and the guiding questions to support that work. In PLC, a module planning tool will be rolled out to support Schrader teachers with this planning for both content areas.

Intentional questioning will be another focus area in both ELA and Math. During our February 2023 District Walkthrough, it was evident that this was an area of needed growth. The focus of planning for Tier 1 instruction will be the primary purpose of PLC work in the 23-24 school year. This work will support the growth we are expecting in Core Action 2.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The goal is to increase our overall ELA proficiencies to 50% in all grades, Math to 50% in K-2, 40% in 3-5, and Science to 45%.

We also plan to increase our ESE and ELL Subgroup total percentage points to 42%.

**Monitoring:**

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

To monitor our underperforming subgroups, we have a variety of structures in place. Schrader has a non-negotiable SWAT time (Students Will Always Triumph) for all grade levels. During this time, teachers, instructional assistants, support facilitators, academic tutors, and our interventionists support Tier 2/3 skills and standards to help close gaps. This occurs 30 minutes daily. Teams meet regularly with coaches to restructure groups based on the data and the needs of the students. To support the data of this work, we also meet every three weeks as a leadership team with team leaders and support facilitators to discuss data and see if kids are making progress. Teams are responsible for their MTSS tracking binder with all their CFAs and other important information. We also monitor all assessments during MFAD days, which occur four times yearly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lee Anne Keith (lyerkey@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.)

Lexia, Heggerty, HMH Resources, Seeing Stars, and UFLI are all research-based interventions that will be utilized on a daily basis during small group and SWAT times.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

They are all district approved resources to be used for Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups.

**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.

Tiered interventions need to be strong, as we must continue to close gaps to increase overall proficiencies and see learning gains from all subgroups.

**Person Responsible:** Lee Anne Keith (lyerkey@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** The end of the 23-24 school 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

According to our 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 scores, K-2, 51% of our students scored at the 50th percentile or higher.

To achieve this goal, there are a variety of resources in place.

Strategies:

- Planning Focus PLCs
- Common Intervention Time
- Intentional Planning/Questioning
- Implementation of Eureka Math 2

Monitoring:

- HMH Module Assessments
- Progress Monitoring Assessments
- DIBELS
- Lexia
- Watch Parties, including subgroup data analysis
- Monitoring for Achievement Days
- Common Formative Assessments during intervention time

- PLC Products
- MTSS binders
- MTSS and Instructional Walkthroughs
- Progress Monitoring
- Imagine Learning

Support:

- Professional Development
- District training on Foundational Framework
- Summer Kagan Training
- Early Release Days/Specialization PD

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

According to our 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 scores, 3-5, 35% of our students scored a Level 3 or higher.

This data shows that 65% of our students are not on track in grades 3-5. To increase these proficiencies, we have a variety of strategies in place.

Strategies:

- Planning Focus PLCs
- Common Intervention Time
- Intentional Planning/Questioning
- Implementation of Eureka Math 2

Monitoring:

- HMH Module Assessments
- Progress Monitoring Assessments
- DIBELS
- Lexia
- Watch Parties, including subgroup data analysis
- Monitoring for Achievement Days
- Common Formative Assessments during intervention time
- PLC Products
- MTSS binders
- MTSS and Instructional Walkthroughs
- Progress Monitoring
- Imagine Learning

Support:

- Professional Development
- District training on Foundational Framework
- Summer Kagan Training
- Early Release Days/Specialization PD

## 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

According to our 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 scores, K-2, 51% of our students scored at the 50th percentile or higher. By FAST PM 3 of 2024, we will increase these overall proficiencies to 60% or higher.

According to our 22-23 DIBELS data, 73% of our Kindergarten students were in Core at the end of PM 3. By the end of the 23-24 school year, we will increase the total of students in Core to 80%. According to our 22-23 DIBELS data, 49% of our 1st graders were in Core at the end of PM 3. By the end of the 23-24 school year, we will increase the total of students in Core to 60%.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to our 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 scores, 3-5, 35% of our students scored a Level 3 or higher. By FAST PM 3 of 2024, we will increase these overall proficiencies to 50% or higher.

## Monitoring

### Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

To address the needs of our underperforming subgroups, we have a variety of structures in place. Schrader has a non-negotiable SWAT time (Students Will Always Triumph) for all grade levels. During this time, teachers, instructional assistants, support facilitators, academic tutors, and our interventionists support Tier 2/3 skills and standards to help close gaps. This occurs 30 minutes daily. Teams meet regularly with coaches to restructure groups based on the data and the needs of the students. To support the data of this work, we also meet every three weeks as a leadership team with team leaders and support facilitators to discuss data and see if kids are making progress. Teams are responsible for their MTSS tracking binder with all their CFAs and other important information.

Another structure we have in place is Monitoring for Achievement Days. These days occur three times a year with all team members. We review data and set goals with an action plan for the upcoming Progress Monitoring cycle. These days are dedicated to looking at all students and all subgroups to determine the needs of all students. Once action plans are set, administration and coaches support teachers with their new plans through PLCs, walkthroughs, coaching cycles, and TBIT/SBIT meetings.

This year, we re-introduced our bi-weekly Teacher Based Intervention Teams (TBIT). These teams are grade level teams that have additional support staff members attached as well. All administrators, coaches, interventionists, the social worker, the psychologist and special area teachers assist the grade level teams in problem solving around students that are not progressing at a normal rate of achievement. Data is collected on each student and interventions are in place for an average of 4-6 weeks. After

multiple rounds of student discussion, if the student is not progressing, then the student is recommended to go to our SBIT (School-Based Intervention Team) for further analysis.

Schrader currently has four support facilitators, two academic tutors, and one reading interventionist that supports underperforming subgroups. These support personnel push in and pull-out groups of students focusing on Tier 2/3 needs. Support facilitators do quarterly progress reports on growth, and all support personnel assist with PMP data in the students' SSS plans.

### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Keith, Lee Anne, lyerkey@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?

The following evidence-based programs is what we will be implementing this year for ELA:

-HMH  
-UFLI  
-Heggerty  
-Seeing Stars  
-SIPPS

### **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?

We follow the district protocols and programs that are in place for our students. The evidence-based programs mentioned above are all aligned to help students with learning gaps. All programs are research-based and approved by both the state and district. They have shown effectiveness in areas to help our struggling subgroups. We will continue to monitor all subgroups throughout the year to ensure the we are seeing thee return on investment of these programs.



**Action Steps to Implement**

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

**Action Step****Person Responsible  
for Monitoring**

Our Instructional Trainer Coaches will actively participate in all 23-24 school year goals. They will work in all PLCs and focus on growth areas to help improve overall student achievement. Coaches will conduct walkthroughs as progress monitoring for our HII and DDD goals. They will facilitate professional development as needed and work closely with our district team to focus on the next steps to increase our overall proficiencies and close gaps. They will facilitate our monthly Watch Parties and quarterly Monitoring for Achievement Days.

Keith, Lee Anne,  
lyerkey@pasco.k12.fl.us

We will also have district support personnel out biweekly to help focus on literacy coaching and leadership school-wide. They will engage the staff in Professional Learning during our Early Release Days and other opportunities throughout the year.

Our coaches will assist teachers with implementing all the assessment platforms used to collect learning performance data. They will analyze data closely all throughout the year and help monitor our school-wide goals. Our coaches will be a big part of the Kagan rollout. They will support the Kagan work from the district and implement it in classrooms and during planning to support the overall engagement of our school.

Keith, Lee Anne,  
lyerkey@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.

Our SAC will play a significant role in our SIP. Having all stakeholders together is a perfect opportunity to share goals and monitor progress throughout the year. Getting input from various stakeholders is crucial when developing and monitoring a state plan. Our monthly School Leadership Team meetings are another monitoring piece we have in place for our SIT. Bringing leaders together is imperative for the monitoring of our SIP. This is an ongoing document to ensure that we are improving student achievement. Our leaders are the face of our school and work diligently to make sure all decisions is genuinely what is best for our students.



<https://ses.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))

Our community relationships are imperative to our school's success. We have a fantastic Parent Involvement Coordinator who goes above and beyond to bring the entire school community together. We plan all kinds of events and family nights, such as Fall Festival, McRaider Nights, Math Nights, Coffee Talks, SAC, and Family First Events/Meetings, just to name a few. Building these relationships helps when it comes down to the academics and their child's progress. When they feel comfortable at a school, they are more willing to come in for Parent Conference Nights, Open Houses, and other student-focused events.

<https://ses.pasco.k12.fl.us/>

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)**

We will continue to offer our Accelerated Math Program here at Schrader. We were one of the first Title One schools to offer it and have had the program for three years. We are excited to continue that track for our high learners. We also are looking to continue our intervention SWAT time for ELA. During that time, we have a slot dedicated to our highest ELA learners to ensure they get the enrichment they need. Another program we are bringing back is the SSYRA program. This is a great incentive program for our students to help them dive deeper into a love for reading. We will have this program K-5. We also implemented BeanStack, a reading log system district-wide.

**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))**

We currently have a Head Start VPK Program and a Pre-K VE program to support our community needs and ensure our students are getting what they need. These programs allow for students to get early intervention and prepared for school.

### **Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

We have a fantastic team of people specializing in specific services to help our students with their social-emotional well-being. Our counselor does many lessons for our students, along with social skills groups. Our Behavior Support Squad provides many different types of social skill groups, behavior plans, and other coping strategies to help support the well-being of all our students. We have a Zen Den and Think Tank to help allow students to take breaks and help them advocate for their needs.

**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))**

Our Accelerated Math program allows students to have an enriched path as they reach secondary and postsecondary schooling.

**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).**

In terms of our schoolwide tiered program to address behavior, we have been plans in place. Being a PBIS school, our Tier 1 encompasses the entire school. This includes our mission, vision, and daily expectations of our Schrader students. We have a universal positive behavior system in place. For students who need that core plus a little more, we have Tier 2 supports in place. Social skill groups, lunch bunches, and other programs are in place to help support behavior. For students who need more than Tier 1 and 2, we have Tier 3 pieces in place for support. Some of those pieces include a check-in/ check-out system and FBA/BIPs.

When looking at early intervention services to support our students, we have multiple tiered interventions in place. We use SIPPS, HMM, DIBELS, Rigby Readers, Lexia, UFLI, Zearn, and other approved resources. We have a SWAT time (Students will Always Triumph) that is a non-negotiable time.

**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))**

We participate in Early Release Days, PLC Push-in, Planning Week PD, district-led PD, and continuing to build Collaborative Culture amongst our staff.

**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))**

We do yearly articulation for our Pre-K students into K. We host Kinder Camp for a week during the summer to help support this transition. Continuing to have 2 adults in the room from Pre-K to Kindergarten to support their needs.

## 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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$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.**

No