

Pasco County Schools

Dr. Mary Giella 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Dr. Mary Giella Elementary School

14710 SHADY HILLS RD, Spring Hill, FL 34610

<https://mges.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.

Strive ~ Develop~ Inspire

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering learners as they build a bridge to a successful future, one learning experience at a time.

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
Bonnett, Tracy	Principal	
Silvestro, Jessica	Assistant Principal	

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.

We completed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment in the Spring. This process included input, feedback, and planning with multiple stakeholders. We met with the leadership team, worked to get staff feedback. We also held a meeting for all parents and community members to review our data, information, and give us input. We took all information from all stakeholders and the leadership/admin team created our school wide goals and strategies.

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))

We will meet quarterly to review student data- FAST, DIBELS, modules, Tier 2/3, etc. We will revise the plan as needed based on this information.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	78%
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	9	19	18	24	13	0	0	0	84	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	
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	2	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 ELA or math	0	0	0	20	12	9	0	0	0	41	
Course failures in ELA or math	0	2	8	4	2	5	0	0	0	21	

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	3	11	10	9	5	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
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	1	9	19	18	24	13	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5
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	2	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 ELA or math	0	0	0	20	12	9	0	0	0	41
Course failures in ELA or math	0	2	8	4	2	5	0	0	0	21

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	3	11	10	9	5	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
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*	42	47	53	50	52	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				53			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			32		
Math Achievement*	44	48	59	53	46	50	49		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				49			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			15		
Science Achievement*	58	50	54	37	50	59	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	33	61	59				77		

** 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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	220
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	325
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	98
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	15	Yes	3	2
ELL	31	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	40	Yes	2	
MUL	32	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	2	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	41			

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	42			44			58					33
SWD	9			21							3	
ELL	27			33							3	33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	41			41			44				5	33
MUL	38			25							2	
PAC												
WHT	43			46			62				4	
FRL	37			40			54				5	27

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	50	53	50	53	49	33	37					
SWD	14	15	24	33	31	17	15					
ELL	29			50								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	40	42		45	48		8					
MUL	58			69								
PAC												
WHT	52	53	45	53	46	26	42					
FRL	42	47	46	46	46	37	26					

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	44	33	32	49	22	15	39					77
SWD	8	30	43	21	15	20	6					
ELL	46			38								77
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47	56		39	22		50					
MUL	70			50								
PAC												
WHT	43	29	30	51	22	22	40					
FRL	37	31	30	44	20	19	40					80

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	48%	51%	-3%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	48%	-3%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	50%	8%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	54%	-8%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	32%	52%	-20%	55%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	49%	8%	51%	6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Our FAST data shows that 5th grade math was below the district average by 22% points. We didn't have a certified teacher in the classroom throughout most of school year. Our STEM coach provided assistance to plan and support. We created a rotation system to support student learning. However, we had many challenges with this system.

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

5th grade math proficiency went from 37% to 22% (15% decrease). We didn't have a certified teacher in the classroom throughout most of school year. Our STEM coach provided assistance to plan and support. We created a rotation system to support student learning. However, we had many challenges with this system.

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.

Our greatest gap was 5th grade math. MGES at 31% and the state was at 55%. We didn't have a certified teacher in the classroom throughout most of school year. Our STEM coach provided assistance to plan and support. We created a rotation system to support student learning. However, we had many challenges with this system.

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

Our 3rd math proficiency was at 58% and the district was at 51%. This is the only area we were above the district average (7% points). Our new STEM coach provided the coaching cycle to support our 3rd grade teachers with planning and instruction.

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

5th grade math proficiency. We have moved/hired 2 new teachers to teach 5th grade STEM. Our STEM coach will provide intense support to assist with planning, instruction, and monitoring results. We have also created a spreadsheet to track student data and plan on increasing our data problem solving with teachers. This will include tracking and problem solving around our lowest 25%.

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

5th Grade Math
Early Literacy
Accelerated 3rd Grade Math
3rd Grade Reading

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

If instructional staff deliver effective instruction/intervention utilizing our ELA and Math series along with the BEST standards, positive learning outcomes for students as measured by the district-wide assessment will reflect MGES in the top five highest performing Title 1 schools in the district.

Measurable Outcome:

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

- Unpack and utilize the updated Math series.
- Continued PD focused on the ELA and Math BEST standards (beyond the surface).
- Conduct Instructional-Rounds by the admin leadership team and teachers using the IPG tool.
- Additional planning time for ELA and Math modules.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor "beyond the surface" standards work and module planning through PLC/PD engagement, planning support, "on the spot" instructional coaching, and assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Bonnett (tbonnett@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.)

Utilizing the IPG tool and planning PD and coaching around the results will strengthen Tier 1 instruction and overall proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increase proficiency in all grade levels and content areas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

If instructional staff utilize formative assessment data to drive decisions as we align instruction/intervention and learning tasks to the BEST standards in ELA and Math, then the district- wide assessments will reflect MGES in the top five highest performing Title 1 schools in the district.

Measurable Outcome:

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

- PLCs will analysis district-wide assessment (STAR/FAST) reports in the fall, winter, and spring utilizing our newly created Discussion Protocol to make data-based decisions and plans relating to the BEST standards in ELA and Math.
- Grade level teams will review prior data (PM3 to PM1 and PM1 to PM2) to problem solve and plan for instruction and tier groups. Intermediate grade levels will dig deeper into the data to track, plan, and support the lowest quartile (use of new spreadsheet and data days).
- Utilize a variety of assessment results (FLKRS, DIBELS, etc.) to focus on tiered supports for our kindergarten and 1st grade students with a focus on Early Literacy. With support of our coaches, teachers will also continue to focus on foundational skills.
- Continue to provide guidance and support on Tier 2 & 3 interventions- structure, planning, implementing, and monitoring (include walkthroughs for tiers of support).

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor by gathering data after each PM window. We will input that information into our school-wide data spreadsheet. This tool will help us track all students in all assessment areas (FAST, modules, Dibels, etc.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Bonnett (tbonnett@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We have created a discussion protocol with guiding questions to allow teachers to focus on the right reports, results, and planning forward. They will utilize the tool to plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increase learning gains for all students and the lowest 25%.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus**#3. 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.

If instructional staff, support staff, and administration focus on student and staff engagement, then the GALLUP engagement results will reflect an increase from previous years' trends.

Measurable Outcome:

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

- The Behavior Committee will continue to be the driving force of PBIS/discipline and will focus on continued needs and supports around concerned areas.
 - Continue to utilize the new behavior supports/team (Behavior Interventionist/Specialist, Behavior Assistant, Behavior IAs) to streamline supports and services.
- Increase teacher/team communication with monthly grade level meetings.
- Utilize Kagan strategies and structures to increase student engagement and learning (Core Action 3).
 - Utilize myStudent as a behavior and parent communication tool.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor behavior data through our myStudent data system. We will pull reports around students, grade levels, areas of concern, and types of behavior. We will provide support systems for all students (Tier 1 & 2 & 3) including our lowest performing subgroups: H, SWD, and ELL..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Silvestro (jsilvest@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We will provide additional PD on behavior and engagement strategies to teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increase engagement and decrease referrals.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

As a system, the Pasco district is engaging in a continuous improvement process always, and annually, we have a more focused reflection to look forward to the next coming school year. During the year, each school reflects and responds to data at the minimum quarterly, and the system engages in regular Calibration Meetings throughout the school year. Additionally, after reflecting on current mid-year data, the system engages in Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). During this time, each school enters a needs assessment process that sets the stage for future planning and includes analysis of student performance, analysis of stakeholder feedback, self-assessment, and site visits. Subsequently, this analysis from each school drives the district planning process and the annual approach to Planning Forward to respond our schools, as well as the allocation of resources in an intentional manner based on the needs identified for each school.

Student Performance is analyzed by reviewing current and trend data by subgroup and school. Data sources include Florida BEST assessments, Statewide Science Assessment, district developed quarterly check results where applicable, and NWEA MAP Growth data. Stakeholder feedback is analyzed by reviewing results from both the student and staff Gallup polls, staff and parent surveys and focus groups.

Multiple tools are used to conduct a self-assessment. Each school and the district use the Cognia Standards for systems accreditation and each school and the district reviews and evaluates its progress toward goals set using the Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE). Instructional Practice Observations, Professional Learning Community (PLC) rubrics, and Tiers of Support rubrics are also completed by each school to gain insight into instructional and support practices.

An Assistant Superintendent, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Specialist, and District personnel engage in individual site visits with school leadership at each school after the school team has completed the first part of their analysis to gain insight into the school's unique needs as well as identify foci for school improvement efforts and needs for implementing the plan.

The conclusion of the CNA results in the identification of the root causes of barriers, the development of a school improvement plan to overcome/reduce barriers to improvement, the allocation of supports needed to implement each school's improvement plan and serves as the foundation for Planning Forward. Schools analyze their plans and basic allocations that will be provided based on district formulas to determine needs for additional allocations, resources and supports. With the school assistant superintendent and the school support team, each school then carefully aligns the additional available funds through Title 1 and/or UniSIG to specific strategies for improvement aimed at reducing barriers to achievement and closing learning gaps for underperforming student groups. This plan for use of additional funding is regularly monitored by the district support team, and is adjusted based on data, including student progress monitoring results, as applicable through the year, with the support of the state BSI team and the Department.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Teachers will follow the district scope and sequence for Reading/ELA. Teachers will utilize the district resources and the HMH textbook series. Teachers will monitor instruction throughout using CFA and state assessments throughout the school year. They will use those results to plan for instruction and provide tier 2 and 3 groups. Professional development will be provided on the ELA BEST standards during PLCs and Early Release days.

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

Teachers will follow the district scope and sequence for Reading/ELA. Teachers will utilize the district resources and the HMH textbook series. Teachers will monitor instruction throughout using CFA and state assessments throughout the school year. They will use those results to plan for instruction and provide tier 2 and 3 groups. Professional development will be provided on the ELA BEST standards during PLCs and Early Release days.

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

If instructional staff deliver effective instruction/intervention utilizing our ELA and Math series along with the BEST standards, positive learning outcomes for students as measured by the district-wide assessment will reflect MGES in the top five highest performing Title 1 schools in the district.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If instructional staff deliver effective instruction/intervention utilizing our ELA and Math series along with the BEST standards, positive learning outcomes for students as measured by the district-wide assessment will reflect MGES in the top five highest performing Title 1 schools in the district.

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.

After each CFA and state assessment (3 times a year), we will review the data and problem solve to make decisions.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bonnett, Tracy, tbonnett@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?

We follow our district K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan. We use all core resources that are evidence based- HMH, SIPSS, Eureka Math, etc. All district approved curriculum and program align with the BEST standards.

Rationale:

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

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

All practices and programs address all needs and concerns for all students. We track this data and information in our mystudent program for all assessments (Tier 1, 2, and 3). Our data shows continued increase in performance, proficiency, and learning gains.

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**

-Professional Development during PLC and Early Release
 -Module Planning
 -PLC- data review and planning
 -Assessment- with reading series and FAST
 -Literacy Coach to check in every other week with each grade level team
 -Coaching cycles when needed

Bonnett, Tracy, tbonnett@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.

We have created a MGES Title 1 Plan that includes our goals, areas of focus, description and rationale, and measurable outcomes. The plan also includes data tracking throughout the school year. This plan is given out to families in our back to school packets, listed on our website, and is also located in our parent resources area. <https://mgcs.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))

We have several parent events planned- Open House, two Parent Teacher Conference Nights (October and January), Curriculum Information/Resource Night, Assessment Info Night, many PTA events, along with utilizing our planners, social media, myStudent communication system, and <https://mgcs.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 utilize the district plan, resources, curriculum mapping, scheduling, intervention tools, etc. to build a solid academic program. We also offer extended school day and extended school year for struggling students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

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

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 school counselor, and behavior team. They work together with our student services team to provide services and support to our students. Examples- parent resources, counseling resources, social skills groups, FBA plans, etc.

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

N/A

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

Our behavior team works with teachers, parents, and students to create behavior plans. These plans include intervention strategies, tracking, support, and monitoring. We meet weekly as a team to discuss our Tier 2 and 3 students. We meet monthly with our School Intervention Team with data to problem solve as a group.

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 meet weekly in PLC. We offer extended module planning. We have 3 academic coaches to work side by side with teachers on planning, implementation, data, etc. We have IAs in every K classroom and several other IAs on campus for Grade 1-5. They work with students on academic interventions. We provide mentors to our new teachers and work closely to build a relationship and provide the supports needed to be successful.

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 offer a K Roundup where parents and children can come to our school to register and visit our campus. We also have a K Camp where incoming children get to become familiar with our campus, routines, staff, and classrooms. Parents are given a presentation on information about the school and provided a tour of the campus.