

Pasco County Schools

Deer Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Deer Park Elementary School

8636 TROUBLE CREEK RD, New Port Richey, FL 34653

<https://dpes.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.

Deer Park's mission is to develop an inclusive environment by maintaining high expectations, growing community relationships, and encouraging family engagement to make life long learners. Our Mission slogan is: Expect More - Achieve More

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our school has a mission and mission slogan. We do not have an individual vision, as we use our mission and slogan to support and utilize our assets to realize our district vision. Our district's vision is to create a world class education for all students. We work hard to ensure that our school is in line with the vision of our district.

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
Middleton, Shannon	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Curriculum Leader -Ensuring that academic policies and curriculum are followed -Developing and tracking benchmarks for measuring institutional success -Helping teachers maximize their teaching potential -Meeting and listening to concerns of students and parents on a regular basis -Encouraging, coaching and assisting student leaders and teachers -Meeting with parents and stakeholders on a regular basis for problem resolution -Enforcing discipline when necessary -Managing the facility and safety needs of the school
Sass, Billie	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Assists in the planning, development, organization, coordination, and supervision of instructional programs and activities; interprets and implements the District approved curriculum program in light of individual school needs. -Assists in providing leadership to the professional staff in determining objectives and identifying school needs as the basis for developing long and short range plans for the school. -Assists the principal in the overall administration of the school and assumes leadership of the school in the absence of the principal. -Assists in the supervision of student enrollment, records, attendance, and health requirements. -Develops plans for emergency situations, in cooperation with staff and public safety agencies. -Maintains a commitment to ongoing growth in self and others, supporting and participating in district and site professional growth programs. -Relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy. -Supervises the reporting and monitoring of student attendance, with follow-up student/parent contact where necessary. -Has knowledge of local policies, state and federal laws relating to minors. -Performs other related duties as needed.

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.

The development of the SIP was a collaborative effort. Data results from the FAST, NWEA, NGSS Science, student unit performance data and parent surveys exposed areas of need and focus for our school. Through numerous discussions and input survey's with school leadership and our School Advisory Council (which is comprised of parents, staff and business partners) our school needs were identified and drove the creation of our school goals.

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))

Monitoring of our SIP will be completed through a variety of ways. Our school PLCs will monitor student unit performance data, Leadership will review the student progress in relation to the SIP goals at their monthly meetings and our SAC committee will review overall school data at their meetings. Each month, results will be analyzed to see if supports and interventions need to be adjusted, intensified, or resources shifted, to better help students close the gap between performance and expectations.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
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) 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	13	19	16	15	14	24	0	0	0	101	
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	13	1	0	0	0	19	
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	18	24	10	0	0	0	52	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	46	18	0	0	0	90	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	20	21	49	40	22	0	0	0	169	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	10

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	4	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	2	0	8	9	9	9	0	0	0	37	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	10	5	1	0	0	0	16	
Course Failures in ELA or math	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8	

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	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	0	8	9	9	9	0	0	0	37	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	10	5	1	0	0	0	16	
Course Failures in ELA or math	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8	

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	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	9
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*	49	47	53	57	52	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				50			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			42		
Math Achievement*	45	48	59	58	46	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				62			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			39		
Science Achievement*	60	50	54	42	50	59	61		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		61	59				80		

** 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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	202
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	32	Yes	1	
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	42			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	75			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	45			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	49			45			60					
SWD	27			24			50				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55			36							2	
HSP	27			27			46				4	
MUL	64			32							2	
PAC												
WHT	51			51			66				4	
FRL	41			36			50				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	57	50	51	58	62	58	42					
SWD	25	50	50	26	41	38	20					
ELL	80			70								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	40	36		52	50							
MUL	65	50		53	80							
PAC												
WHT	61	52	46	62	61	55	48					
FRL	50	49	50	52	55	48	33					

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	61	55	42	57	55	39	61					80
SWD	41	35		39	61		42					
ELL	43			50								80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	42	38		36	62		54					
MUL	56			56								
PAC												
WHT	65	59	47	61	54	33	66					
FRL	57	55	40	52	50	27	60					

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	51%	11%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	54%	46%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	59%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	25%	54%	-29%	61%	-36%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	52%	2%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	49%	13%	51%	11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

In the 21-22 year our lowest area of performance was in ELA. There was a decline in proficiency, and learning gains. There year the 22-23 FAST data showed us a drop in Mathematics, particularly in 4th and 5th grade mathematics. What we are seeing in a trend in student performance as related to core instruction. One contributing factor may me the new implementation of the our new ELA instructional series. Each time there is new core material, it takes time for teachers to understand and how to plan with it.

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

The area of greatest decline for us was in Mathematics, when looking at the 21-22 data and the data that came back from the 22-23 FAST results. We had a new instructional frame work of a 50/50 math model of direct instruction and computer practice time. It worked very well in primary but the intermediate teachers were nearly as consistent because they were also trying to teach advanced math simultaneously.

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.

In our 21-22 data the gap was in ELA but in our 22-23 FAST data we also saw the biggest gap to be ELA. Again, we have a new ELA series that teachers were trying to learn. Overall, however, we discussed a need to go back to plan strong core instruction.

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

In 21-22 data our biggest improvement was in our lowest quartile. In our 22-23 FAST data our improvement was in Science out performing the district and state. We believe that this was a result of being able to build on past instruction and becoming more proficient in delivering the core instruction. There were too many changes to our core (ELA had new materials and Math had a new instructional framework for our math block).

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

One area of concern for us is attendance. We have been working with our social worker to improve attendance. This is, also, an area of concern for our district, The district is creating an attendance campaign for our county. A second area of concern for us, is work completion. When we reviewed our discipline data, we saw that the root cause of the referrals was work avoidance. In talks with out PBIS committee, we decided to change one of our school expectations to "Complete Work" and our staff is participating in Kagan strategies training to engage more students in the classroom.

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

1. Improvement in ELA proficiency and learning gains, with a focus on foundational learning.
2. Improvement in Math proficiency and learning gains with the use of new math materials.
3. Increase student engagement in all content areas, with the use of Kagan strategies.
4. Increasing staff and student engagement and create a strengths-based organization to strengthen school culture. We want students to want to come to school and enjoy their learning experiences.
5. Maintain our Science proficiency.

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 Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As a school, we will strengthen our collaborative culture by increasing student engagement (show growth on the Gallup student survey from this years baseline of 3.86 in engagement and 4.11 in hope) and creating a strengths based organization that increases employee engagement (show growth on the Gallup staff survey from this year's baseline of 3.98) by utilizing individual staff strengths to create a positive work environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will show growth on the Gallup student survey from this years baseline of 3.86 in student engagement and 4.11 in hope in student engagement. We will, also be creating a strengths based organization that increases employee engagement show growth on the Gallup staff survey from this year's baseline of 3.98.

Monitoring:

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

Look for:

- Utilize Kagan strategies to build a sense of collaboration, engagement and fun with our students as they learn their content
- Engage in a staff retreat to work on school mission and commitment to our school's work
- Strengths to help staff better understand each other and collaborate
- Class meetings will be utilized to problem solve and build classroom culture
- PBIS team will recognize positive student behavior
- Engage staff in Gallup professional development to learn about their strengths
- School will partner with parents to ensure clear lines of communication about academic and behavioral expectations through grade level parent nights
- In order to support our SWD students in the Special Areas, we will facilitate more communication opportunities between both groups of teachers.

Evidence

- Decline in Office Discipline Referrals
- Decline in Classroom Think Sheets as evidenced in Early Warning System
- CFA Data, Mid and End of Module Assessments, FAST results
- Social Emotional Maturity using better problem-solving strategies
- Gallup Poll Survey results for both staff and students
- Consistent Tier I and Tier II PBIS school wide systems in place
- School calendar utilized for meeting planning

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

The research-based interventions strategies that we will be engaging in are:

- Utilize Kagan strategies to build a sense of collaboration, engagement and fun with our students as they learn their content
- Engage in a staff retreat to work on school mission and commitment to our school's work
- Strengths to help staff better understand each other and collaborate
- Class meetings will be utilized to problem solve and build classroom culture

- PBIS team will recognize positive student behavior
- Engage staff in Gallup professional development to learn about their strengths

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting the following interventions, are as follows:

- Kagan structures. Kagan has a long history and solid data of success of student performance increasing through increased student engagement.
- Gallup data shows a strong correlation to increased work performance when organizations engagement in strengths work and become strength-based organizations.
- Strong research shows that class meeting create strong class cultures and increases interpersonal relationships with peers and their teacher.
- There is an abundance that show positive reinforcement through PBIS increases a students willingness to engage in school.

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.

- Gallup strength trainer needed (secured by admin)
- Class meeting structures (secured through district behavioral team)
- Kagan training (secure through district)
- PBIS supports 9Secured through district)

Person Responsible: Shannon Middleton (smiddlet@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: All profession development will be secured by the start of school and at minimum addressed monthly.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Another area of focus for our school is students with disabilities. In the 21-22 data, our index percentage was 36%. Well below the Federal index of 41%. In our FAST data of 22-23, our students with disabilities again show a lack of student growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal for our students with disabilities is that they make a year's worth of growth and that, at minimum, our school meets or exceeds the federal percentage of 41%. This would break the cycles of this subgroup performing below the 41% for more than two years.

Monitoring:

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

Evidence and monitoring look for:

- Walk-through data/feedback
- Walkthrough evidence of UFLI implementation
- CFA Data, Mid & End of Module data, Dibels, FAST results
- SIPP data, Seeing Stars Data
- PLC artifacts/products & PD agenda/artifact
- Lesson plans

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Middleton (smiddlet@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Our Support Facilitators will be engaging in professional development to use the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes evidence-based Seeing Stars Program, which will be a sensory-cognitive approach that can be differentiated to provide intensive intervention for students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes evidence-based Seeing Stars Program, which will be a sensory-cognitive approach that can be differentiated to provide intensive intervention for students with disabilities was selected to ensure that we were engaging all the sensory input pathways to help students experience the content.

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.

- Support facilitators need training in the the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes evidence-based Seeing Stars Program (secured by admin through the district)
- Master Schedule needs to ensure that Support Facilitators can access SWD students (admin created the master schedule)
- Implementation and monitoring of instructional delivery (admin responsible)

Person Responsible: Shannon Middleton (smiddlet@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Instruction in the Seeing Stars program will need to start by week two of school after the basic education teachers have had an opportunity to create and practice classroom routines and after the Support Facilitators have gone in to introduce themselves, start relationship building and explaining their purpose to the children.

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

To address K-2 instruction specifically, we will:

- Implement a systemic planning practice to create lessons that account for all of the elements of the Reading and Writing literacy block and engage teachers in planning for a common vision of rigorous instruction that ensures teachers have a clear understanding of what student should be able to know, understand and do.
- Implement Kagan Engagement strategies
- Implement UFLI to strengthen our instructional foundational practices
- Engage in lesson planning that implements high level questioning
- Implement Lexia to support student remediation and enrichments, as well as, address the subgroups that need additional supports
- Implement data reviews that target student's individual needs and plan highly effective intervention groups
- To address our lowest performing subgroup (SWD), we will provide additional instructional supports (previewing groups and ESD groups), leverage Support Facilitation to deliver the Linda Mood Bell Seeing Stars Program.

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

To address 3-5 instructional practices specifically:

- Implement a systemic planning practice to create lessons that account for all of the elements of the Reading and Writing literacy block and engage teachers in planning for a common vision of rigorous instruction that ensures teachers have a clear understanding of what student should be able to know, understand and do.
- Implement Kagan Engagement strategies
- Engage in lesson planning that implements high level questioning
- Implement Lexia to support student remediation and enrichments, as well as, address the subgroups

that need additional supports

- Implement data reviews that target student's individual needs and plan highly effective intervention groups
- To address our lowest performing subgroup (SWD), we will provide additional instructional supports (previewing groups and ESD groups), leverage Support Facilitation to deliver the Linda Mood Bell Seeing Stars Program.
- In addition, our Reading coach will be facilitating the intermediate PLC planning times to help ensure that there is a deep level of instructional planning and a common vision of instruction,

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

-Students will show increased performance on FAST test in PM3 (one years worth of growth over the baseline data in PM1)

-Students will show increased performance on DIBLES test in PM3 (one years worth of growth over the baseline data in PM1)

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

-Students will show increased performance on FAST test in PM3 (one years worth of growth over the baseline data in PM1)

-Students will show increased performance on DIBLES test in PM3 (one years worth of growth over the baseline data in PM1)

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.

Evidence and monitoring and it's impact on student achievement.

- Walk-through data/feedback- This data will be collected quarterly and reviewed with teacher to strengthen their planning and instructional practices. This will increase student achievement to ensure that they are engaging in the work, processing the content and showing evidence of their learning.
- Walkthrough evidence of UFLI implementation- This instructional practice will create common vocabulary among the teachers, create equity within each classroom of foundational instruction. In turn this will increase student understanding of foundational skills.
- CFA Data, Mid & End of Module data, Dibels, FAST results - This data will show us through out the year (bi-weekly in PLC and quarterly, as a school), if our efforts are impacting student performance.
- SIPP data, Seeing Stars Data- This data will show us through out the year (bi-weekly in PLC and quarterly, as a school), if our efforts are impacting student performance.
- PLC artifacts/products & PD agenda/artifact & Lesson plans- Will show the rigor of teacher planning.

The impact of student achievement is that teachers will be better prepared for misconceptions and enrichment opportunities, if needed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Middleton, Shannon, smiddlet@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 new ELA evidence programs being implemented are:

-In ELA, the Lind Mood Bell Seeing Stars program was vetted through our district AND the state for use in Florida schools.

- In ELA, the UFLI program was vetted through our district for use and follows the state approved curriculum parameters.

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?

All of our new programs were met our school's areas of need and were provided by our school district. The district ensured that there was evidence-based data and on the state's approve list for usage.

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
<p>-The teaching and administration will be trained in Kagan engagement strategies. After initial PD, there will be follow up mini PD completed by our ELA coach and data will be monitored for increased student participation and achievement.</p> <p>-The primary teaching staff will engage in UFLI training in a train the trainer model. Follow up will occur at PLCs monthly and student foundation data will be reviewed for effectiveness.</p> <p>-The Seeing Stars program will be implemented by our Support Facilitators. They will engage in district level training and be monitored through lessons and walk-throughs. Student data for SWD students will be reviewed for increased proficiency.</p>	<p>Middleton, Shannon, smiddlet@pasco.k12.fl.us</p>