

Pasco County Schools

River Ridge Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

River Ridge Middle School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

<https://rrms.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.

To provide a world-class education to all students. We exist to provide a culture of instructional excellence and collaboration to enable ALL students to achieve.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All of our students achieve success...in college...career...and life. ALL of our students will be productive citizens who are respectful, responsible, and problem-solvers.

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
Adams, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Lead, High Impact Instruction
Murphy, Angie	Principal	Monitor the progress of implementing and meeting SuP goals, School Culture
Addington, April	Graduation Coach	Supporting at risk student population, providing intervention assistant to staff and students, and monitoring progress of Data Driven Decisions goals
Baumaister, Chrissy	Instructional Coach	Providing professional learning to support Sup Goals in collaborative structures, management, etc. Mentors new staff and monitors ELA progress
Brissey, Melina	Assistant Principal	ELA/Reading, PBIS, Testing Coordination
Cione, Thomas	Behavior Specialist	School Behavior Program Lead
Corley, Joseph	Paraprofessional	Lead for Student Support Assistants - Collaborative Culture goal
Darling, Abby	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTAE digital tools and industry certification progress - high impact instruction
Fallon-Johnson, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	High Impact Instruction - ELA_Civics Facilitator
Fields, Tamara	Teacher, K-12	World History Facilitator-High Impact Instruction
Gibbons, Kourtney	Teacher, K-12	ELA/Reading Teacher and Facilitator-High Impact Instruction
Grubbs, Daniell	Assistant Principal	8th Grade AP, SBP coordinator, PBIS
James, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Science Facilitator - High Impact Instruction
Martanovic, Kristen	Assistant Principal	Social Studies, Student Services, High Impact Instruction
Stanton, Monica	School Counselor	Student Services - Data Driven Decisions
Thompson, Gina	Teacher, ESE	ESE Lead Teacher - High Impact Instruction
Zampella, Michael	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Math Facilitator - High Impact Instruction

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.

A comprehensive needs assessment was completed by the school leadership team. Then, the recommendations based on the data were provided to seek input through PLC structures (staff), SAC, PTSA, and our student focus group, Royal Ambassadors.

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))

Each quarter we analyze data and monitor progress toward the success plan goals through school leadership team, grade level teams to determine trends, and the SAC. We publish a "health of the school" document to provide transparency and ensure that reflection is taking place by each stakeholder group to make changes along the way.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B

	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	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	6	8	36	50	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	172	215	493	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	116	127	356	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	69	72	236	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	54	59	184	

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	65	69	0	134

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	13	9	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	59	58	144
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	5	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	104	123	303
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	76	84	263
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	53	55	138

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) 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	13	9	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	59	58	144
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	5	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	104	123	303
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	76	84	263
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	53	55	138

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	

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	48	49	48	46	50	49		
ELA Learning Gains				48			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			35		
Math Achievement*	59	58	56	52	34	36	53		
Math Learning Gains				58			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			39		
Science Achievement*	46	46	49	43	54	53	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	70	68	73	59	58	69		
Middle School Acceleration	67	60	73	73	50	49	69		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					72	70			
ELP Progress	29	35	40	45	65	76	70		

** 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	528
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	32	Yes	4	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	48			
MUL	60			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	62			
FRL	44			

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	55			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	49			59			46	77	67			29
SWD	19			32			13	58	38		5	
ELL	33			39				54			4	29
AMI												
ASN	69			69							2	
BLK	44			42			20				3	
HSP	43			51			35	69	54		6	36

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	43			58			61	79			4	
PAC												
WHT	50			61			49	78	72		5	
FRL	39			49			39	71	42		6	25

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	48	48	34	52	58	54	43	73	73			45
SWD	19	30	22	21	48	46	14	42	55			
ELL	43	49	36	45	54	60	50	85				45
AMI												
ASN	64	63		88	63				94			
BLK	31	39	29	35	56	42	12	54				
HSP	47	50	30	48	61	62	45	71	79			
MUL	54	55	50	53	60	47	46	83	63			
PAC												
WHT	49	47	33	53	57	54	44	73	71			
FRL	39	42	27	41	51	48	35	63	60			

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	49	45	35	53	41	39	56	69	69			70
SWD	18	31	27	23	34	36	31	26	53			
ELL	46	58	67	49	47	38	40	65				70
AMI												
ASN	62	65		79	68		75	93	76			
BLK	40	39		36	25			69				
HSP	48	43	35	42	31	23	49	67	68			
MUL	45	47	53	42	43	38	41	72	67			
PAC												
WHT	49	44	33	55	42	42	57	68	69			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
FRL	37	40	32	39	40	42	43	56	51			

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
07	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	47%	-1%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	46%	2%	47%	1%
09	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	48%	*
06	2023 - Spring	44%	46%	-2%	47%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	51%	54%	-3%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	42%	48%	-6%	48%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	67%	-1%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	46%	-1%	44%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	50%	42%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	49%	49%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	70%	5%	66%	9%

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.

Gaps in learning was evident based on historical state assessment data from grade level to grade level and student to student. Science proficiency was 45% (32% scoring a Level 2) and Math 7 proficiency was 41%. 30% of students scored a Level 1 in math. 32% scored a Level 1 in ELA in each grade level. Instruction as lost due to not having a permanent teacher in science.

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

From PM1 to PM 3, all test areas improved over time. New assessment to measure progress and proficiency.

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.

Science was 45% profiient which included 7th grade accl. science, math increased in all areas but 7th grade math was below 50% (41%), ELA scores were stagnant in all grade levels. Students with disabilities and black students did not meet ESSA proficiency (2021). Lack of staffing in science, math, and ELA classrooms.

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

Lack of staffing in science, math, and ELA classrooms for the entire year. In the science classrooms, increase focus on holistic engagement strategies and content area specific ie. science labs, inquiry, simulations. Plannign based onthe engineering cycle to increase critical thinking and using the district provided myLearning course with fidelity.

ELA continues to deepen understanding of the district curriculum and the sue of Lexia as a Tier 2/3 intervention with small group. There is now a stand alone 7th grade reading intervention course for all Level 1 students.

Math will need to fill the gaps during daily intervention time due to lack of staff and limited content. Tier 2/3 intervention will be crucial to close the gaps.

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

The amount of OSS assigned to students

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

-Creating a learning environment that has solid and consistent structures that are conducive to maximizing learning therefore increasing student achievement and decreasing behaviors.

-By implementing a new bell schedule that aligns with daily intervention, providing multiple opportunities for second chance learning and enrichment.

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 Student Engagement**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.

In evaluating our walkthrough data, we want to see continued increase in authentic student engagement with students taking ownership for their learning. The need to continue to focus on Core Action 3 (collaborative and cooperative classrooms) on the IPG tool and having the teachers release the instruction to the students quicker is a must to increase student engagement.

-Course Performance: All quarters, between progress report and report card, the number of students academically on-track doubled.

-No 8th grade students needed to attend ESY, 0 were retained.

-District Final Data in all electives and core courses met or exceeded the district performance levels

-Gallup: Increase in all areas including employee and student engagement

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of classroom teachers will create a classroom learning environment that fosters positive relationship by increasing student engagement and achievement through intentional planning with PLCs, delivering instruction that aligns with the rigor of the standards, implementing high-leverage engagement strategies, and monitoring student progress as evidenced by FAST/EOC progress monitoring (5% overall increase in each tested area), NWEA Benchmarks, CFAs, and weekly classroom walkthroughs.

Monitoring:

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

Complete walkthroughs and provide implementation through professional learning to increase focus on holistic engagement strategies and content specific ie. science labs, inquiry, simulations, etc. There will be a focus on Kagan structures in all classrooms. Core Action 2/3 to release discussion and work to students; focus on deeper understanding of math, ELA, science, and new Civics curriculum.

Through monthly 2-hour profession learning sessions, focused on Kagan structures implementation, teacher's comfort level and understanding will be assessed through self-reflection and needs assessment surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chrissy Baumaister (cbaumais@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.)

Continue to work with Core Actions 2 and 3 thorough monthly mini-workshops, PLC-focus modeling, and share session sin a grab-and-go format for all content areas.

-Intentional engagement and collaboration structures (Kagan) used school-wide

-Question sequencing/intentionally planned questions

-Transition from teacher moves to student actions to enhance and deepen teacher understanding through IPG and classroom modeling

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Kagan structures promote student ownership by building a strong classroom community and putting all students in control of their learning. The structures do not allow students to "hid" and reinforce that all students must participate.

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.

Professional Development will focus on implementing the Team Teaching Assessing Cycle, Core Action 2/3, classroom management/engagement strategies/structures (Kagan), and pulling and analyzing data based on standards for intervention and enrichment.

Person Responsible: Chrissy Baumaister (cbaumais@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Whole group (monthly) PLC (weekly)

Complete walkthroughs and provide implementaiton professional learing to increase focus on holistic engagement strategies/structures and content area specific ie. science labs, inquiry, simulations, etc.

Person Responsible: Angie Murphy (amurphy@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

#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.

Data review of course performance, standardized tests, NWEA, Lexia, nad ODRs indicates a need for more specialized PD in the area of understnading and assisting SWD academically and behaviorally as well as other minority groups (black). Data indicates that SWD and black students are lagging behind their peers in mainstream and self-contained classes.

This gorup has historically lagged behind other groups in proficiency/made striges in learning gains in school-wide FAST learning gains. In math, proficiency has decreased in FAST math but learning gains increased. Did not meet the ESSA proficiency requirements 2021.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase student achievement with focus on Students with Disabilities (SWD) and black students specifically Social Behavioral Program reducing SBP ODRs and increase student proficiency on FAST/EOC, quarterly benchmark assessments by 5%, as evidenced by standards-based teaching strategies, PBIS strategies, implementing a Level System for Behavior and trauma informed care. Also, implementing a CICO with point sheet and mentor system for students at risk and off track, specifically SWD.

Monitoring:

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

Review weekly in PLC's CFA data; review weekly in Student Success Meetings discipline, CICO and academic data; review bi-monthly through leadership feedback and GLT feedback on grade performance data to determine proactive response; review quarterly with leadership and student success team to prepare response; semester data chats with students and stakeholders. Aggregate data based on subgroups (SWD, Black).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniell Grubbs (dgrubbs@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.)

PBIS Strategies, Kagan structures, team teach and assessment cycle PLC guiding questions, using the district provided curriculum like their mainstream peers, academic and social behavior strategies, CICO program, USF CARD support through PD

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data review of course performance, standardized tests, NWEA, Lexia, and ODRs indiciates a need for more specialized PD in the area of understanding and assisting SWD academically and behaviorally. Data indicates that SWD and black students are lagging behind their peers in mainstream and self-contained classes.

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.

Teacher PLCs will plan instructional units, create CFAs based on BEST standards. PLCs will implement the TTAC multiple times throughout the quarter. SBP self-contained teachers will plan with mainstream peers.

Person Responsible: Thomas Cione (tcione@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will share standards, expected outcomes, and student data with students through posted learnign goals and reflection conferences.

Person Responsible: Daniell Grubbs (dgrubbs@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Read, write, think, talk opportunities with Kagan structures in every lesson, every day using grade level texts and research-based strategies.

Person Responsible: Daniell Grubbs (dgrubbs@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily

PLC members will analyze quarterly data using Data Chat Protocols. After assessments, PLCs will determine who, how, when and what materials will be used for additional mastery learning opportunities.

Person Responsible: Daniell Grubbs (dgrubbs@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly, each CFA

#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.

Discipline Data: 1,082 referrals (320 students)

662 SWD referrals (120 students)

323 SWD self-contained referrals (33 students)

Highest incidents was defying, disobeying, disrespecting school personal

There was 493 OSS incidents, 436 ISS incidents (students are missing too much instructional time).

On a positive, there were 109,624 PBIS points distributed for the year and 1,023 Shields of Honor.

There is a concern from stakeholders, as evidenced in the Gallup and other sources, that behaviors resulting in ODRs maybe due to disconnect between expectations, understanding of trauma, student disabilities, and relationship building.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase student and staff engement by fostering a "Culture of Caring" within the RRMS community by implementing restorative practices as evidenced by a decrease in the number of students earning ODRs by 3% based on myEWS and myStudent data and a 2% increase in Gallup employee and student survey results, and earning School PBIS recognition.

Monitoring:

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

The Student Support Assistants and Adminstration (Behavior Intervention Team) will pull data from myStudent reviewing discipline incidents, trends, and tier students for supports. Quarterly data will be pulled from myEWS to monitor subgroup data in regards to discipline and amount of instructional time lossed. Bi-weekly MTSS team meetings with updates to the school-wide intervention spreadsheet will assist in monitoring student success with CICO.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniell Grubbs (dgrubbs@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.)

School-wide behavior intervention plan with on-ramps for team-based decision-making wil lfocus on exhibiting Knightly Values, restorative practices, and academic and social behavior, including Royal Rewards incentives for "on track" and students' growth in academic/behavior/attendance.

-Check In Check Out program, Build PBIS "pillars of support" beyond the guiding coalition, strengthen academic and behavioral ATS, After School Detention, Saturday School, and with in classroom interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A common and consistent school-wide intervention plan with restorative practices embedded as there is a concern about the amount of instructional time lost due to disruption, processing, and consequences related to ODRs and OSS incidents.

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.

School-wide behavior intervention plan with on-ramps and team-based decision-making will focus on how to exhibit the Knightly Values, restorative practices, mindfulness education, Royal Rewards, public praise for Shields of Honor/Student of the Month.

Person Responsible: Melina Brissey (mdinamid@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily

Behavior Intervention Team will collaborate with the Student Support Team and behavior specialist to address students with multiple early warning risk factors and enroll in Check In Check Out. All staff will be trained on the digital check in check out and procedures for mentorship of at risk students.

Person Responsible: Daniell Grubbs (dgrubbs@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Engage staff in professional learning to utilize strengths within collaboration opportunities and monitor growth through semester feedback sessions with administration. School-wide professional learning on expectations and routines for the beginning and end of each class period, including teaching the appropriate use of technology and cell phones with stoplight strategy, voice levels, consistent hall pass, and bell-to-bell instruction.

Person Responsible: Daniell Grubbs (dgrubbs@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily - PD Monthly

#4. 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.

At the end of 22-23 SY, 5 students needed promotion recovery. A significant number of students met standards expectations on district finals, Civics EOC, and FAST ELA/Math. That data will be used to ensure that staff are closely aligning grading and instructional practices to standard expectations in the 23-24 school year. We will increase the focus on district-provided CFAs and benchmarks to be given at least bi-weekly, to be analyzed timely in PLCs to provide for differentiation and second chance learning opportunities to demonstrate mastery.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Second Chance Learning Opportunities (Tiered interventions), alignment of standards-based instruction, intervention, and assessment will result in a decrease of the number of students earning a "D" or "F" by 5% (from quarter to quarter) based on myEWS and myStudent data.

Monitoring:

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

Review weekly in PLCs CFA data; review weekly in Student Success meetings academic data; review bi-monthly through leadership feedback and GLT feedback on grade performance data to determine proactive response; review quarterly with leadership and student success team to prepare reactive response; semester data chats with students and stakeholders. Build and deepen understanding of Second Chance Learning Opportunities, standards recovery, and alternative performance assessment within PLCs/GLTs through professional learning sessions in ERD, modeling by the Student Success Teams and with bi-weekly monitoring of common gradebooks in PLCs by support team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Martanovic (kmartano@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.)

Daily intervention schedule with extra 20 minutes for each period per week. PLC will calendar intervention days in the classroom to address standards that student are not meeting proficiency. We will utilize Edmentum and Tier 2/3 supports built into the Secondary Learning Network. Deepen understanding of mastery learning, second chance learning opportunities, and equitable grading practices. Monitoring will take place in the PLC and GLT notebooks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will need to receive PD and coaching on how to determine will, skill and enrichment needs, Teachers will then need the resources to provide interventions and enrichment opportunities through flexible scheduling and access to technology. The rationale is to increase opportunities for mastery learning. According to FSAA science assessment results, science teachers need to more closely align instruction with the standards-based materials provided in the Secondary Learning Network.

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.

-Full grade-level team (GLT) bi-weekly to collect, analyze, and build support plans for at risk and off-track students based on EWS factors. PLCs will meet weekly to analyze data to build in supports through flexible instructional time for interventions.

-Weekly Student Success Team meetings and bi-weekly MTSS meetings to engage in problem solving cycle for students needing CICO interventions

-Quarterly data chats with students and staff to build relationships and review academic/behavioral data and goals/strengths. Communicate outcomes with stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Kristen Martanovic (kmartano@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly, Monthly

-Increase understanding of SCLO, standards-based recovery with APEX/Edmentum, and alternative assessments through myLearning and sharing effective strategies through the Leadership Team. Pull weekly grade report and send out reminders to staff to use opportunity hall in the ALL.

Person Responsible: April Addington (aaddingt@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

-Quarterly lessons from Student Services using Naviance for career and academic planning

Person Responsible: Monica Stanton (mstanto@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

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

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

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**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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****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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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)

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
4	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