

Pasco County Schools

Anclore 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Anclote Elementary School

3610 MADISON ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://aes.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.

Anclote Sailors - Believe, Achieve and Lead.

Believe - With all of our hearts

Achieve - With all our mind

Lead - With all might

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will be proficient leaders, readers and mathematicians by 3rd grade and maintain or improve every year thereafter.

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
Thomas, Ellen	Principal	All instructional leadership functions of a school. Shaping a vision of academic success for all students. Creating a climate hospitable to education. Cultivating leadership in others. Managing people, data and processes.
Griffin, Kara	Assistant Principal	All instructional leadership functions of a school. Shaping a vision of academic success for all students. Creating a climate hospitable to education. Cultivating leadership in others. Managing people, data and processes.

Attendance/
Social Work

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.

SLT was invited to analyze data and provide input on what actions/goals need to be taken to levelup in the school year. Discussion was led for Staff. Parents provided input during CNA time in the 22-23 school year.

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))

During each monthly SLT meeting, current data, walk through information and any other pertinent information will be presented and discussed. If changes or PD needs to occur based on input and results, they process will be developed.

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	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	82%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	7	6	7	5	8	5	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	5	2	4	9	3	10	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	23	18	0	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	40	23	27	0	0	0	90	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	10	0	7	24	0	0	0	0	51	

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	6	0	1	1	2	5	0	0	0	15

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	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
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	12	13	12	10	17	0	0	0	64	
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	3	6	14	0	0	0	28	
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	21	13	32	0	0	0	66	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	23	48	0	0	0	103	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	15	12	41	13	22	0	0	0	106	
Course Failures	1	0	2	3	0	27	0	0	0	33	

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	1	4	6	8	2	16	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	12	13	12	10	17	0	0	0	64	
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	3	6	14	0	0	0	28	
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	21	13	32	0	0	0	66	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	23	48	0	0	0	103	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	15	12	41	13	22	0	0	0	106	
Course Failures	1	0	2	3	0	27	0	0	0	33	

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	1	4	6	8	2	16	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	17
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*	40	47	53	38	52	56	36		
ELA Learning Gains				51			21		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			19		
Math Achievement*	41	48	59	38	46	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				44			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			29		
Science Achievement*	38	50	54	31	50	59	24		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	71	61	59	47			68		

** 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	229
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
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	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	22	Yes	4	1
ELL	26	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	4	4
HSP	47			
MUL	25	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	41			
FRL	46			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	3	3
HSP	44			
MUL	32	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	40			41			38					71
SWD	21			28							3	
ELL	0			8							3	71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			31							2	
HSP	49			49			36				4	
MUL	20			30							2	
PAC												
WHT	41			41			48				4	
FRL	38			40			32				5	80

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	38	51	64	38	44	42	31					47
SWD	18	50	67	28	35		6					
ELL	40	58		13	38		40					47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	21		26	40							
HSP	36	64		36	52		32					
MUL	21			43								
PAC												
WHT	41	51	58	40	41	41	34					
FRL	30	49	66	36	43	48	24					27

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	36	21	19	39	33	29	24					68
SWD	17	19		27	44		15					
ELL	14	15		32	31		15					68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			33								
HSP	29	11		35	30		14					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41	27		43	33		35					
FRL	31	17	8	34	26	23	17					67

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	49%	51%	-2%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	55%	-19%	58%	-22%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	48%	-15%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	25%	50%	-25%	59%	-34%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	54%	1%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	34%	52%	-18%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	32%	49%	-17%	51%	-19%

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.

School Grading Percentages • A = 62% of points or greater • B = 54% to 61% of points • C = 41% to 53% of points • D = 32% to 40% of points • F = 31% of points or less

Reading underperformed all other areas. Non certified teachers in classrooms, inconsistent staff for supporting classrooms. Depth of knowledge in foundational skills at primary grades. Upper grades lens of expectations for performance assessments.

Trends in reading are down over 3 years. Sub groups are underperforming in all areas.

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

This is a benchmark year for new assessments. It is difficult to analyze what the contributing factors are. However, the levels of proficient students has declined. One major factor is the lack of certified teachers and/or teachers with experience.

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.

Reading proficiency in all 3 grade levels showed the greatest gap. This year we had 3 intermediate classrooms that did not have a certified teacher. Data in these classrooms lagged. In addition, we had a new ELA coach who had a learning curve for her new position. 3rd grade Language Arts also underperformed, with an uncertified teacher serving 50% of the students in the grade level.

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

Our 5th grade showed marked improvement in reading for PM3. We went from having no certified teacher to using our coach and academic tutors for the ELA classroom in PM3. It was apparent how much progress could be made with a highly effective teaching staff.

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

Attendance and Number of students achieving Level 1 on their FAST assessments in reading, math and Science.

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

Number of students Proficient - Goal 62%

Attendance - Goal 97%

Leadership Roles for each student

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

This subgroup has underperformed for 3 straight years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All PLC's will focus on proficiency in each area by subgroup for this schoolyear. Our goal is to have at least 62% of 3-5th grade students proficient in reading, math and science.

Monitoring:

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

We will be utilizing a data wall in the PLC room to post data and respond in PLCs to create action plans that will address the current need and then monitor for intervention success. In addition, walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure effective teaching strategies are being utilized in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ellen Thomas (ethomas@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.)

For reading we will utilize Lexia and SIPPS for our intervention resource. Teachers will be trained in the systematic use of the resource.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lexia is a strong rated resource to assist with skill building at the Tier one level. SIPPS is moderately rated as a Tier 2 resource.

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.

Teachers will be trained on desegregating the data to hone in on subgroup proficiencies and needs.

Person Responsible: Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/2023

#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.

This subgroup has underperformed for 3 straight years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All PLC's will focus on proficiency in each area by subgroup for this schoolyear. Our goal is to have at least 62% of 3-5th grade students proficient in reading, math and science.

Monitoring:

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

We will be utilizing a data wall in the PLC room to post data and respond in PLCs to create action plans that will address the current need and then monitor for intervention success. In addition, walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure effective teaching strategies are being utilized in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

For reading we will utilize Lexia and SIPPS for our intervention resource. Teachers will be trained in the systematic use of the resource.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lexia is a strong rated resource to assist with skill building at the Tier one level. SIPPS is moderately rated as a Tier 2 resource.

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.

Teachers will be trained during PLC structured time on how to read and respond to data.

Person Responsible: Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/2023

Teachers will created Tiered action plans to meet the needs of learners in the T2 and T3 groupings.

Person Responsible: Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: 2023-2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Many subgroups have underperformed over the past 3 years. Reading will be a focus of the interventions for the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan on having a minimum of 62% of our students score in the proficient levels on their FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be tracked and a data wall will be utilized to illustrate the proficiency of each class/student by subject for each module assessment. We will also track results at PM 1,2, and 3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We will utilize Lexia and SIPPS as our T1 and T2 intervention resource. At the primary level we will test the use of UFLI as a resource for reading foundations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lexia and SIPPS are considered strong and moderately rated intervention protocols. Most teachers have been trained on their usage.

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

#4. 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.

Positive culture and environment is critical when addressing the reason children come to school and excel. Attendance is improved. We must intentionally provide leadership roles to our students so they can become drivers of their learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Attendance will improve to 97% in attendance over the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Daily teachers will track classrooms with perfect attendance.

Weekly data will be posted to indicate the percentage of students in attendance by grade level.

Monthly a attend-dance party will be planned for students in grades that are at 97% in attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kara Griffin (kgriffin@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.)

Tracking data and informing parents of the results and goals will help to address the attendance issue at the school. Districtwide we have seen a decline in attendance. I believe the District focus on attendance as a driver of achievement will also help to improve attendance. In addition, we will "Nudge" parents about their child's attendance via emails and messages.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Informing parents about their child's absences and the repercussions of not being in school and under performance will be targeted through informative means.

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.

Attendance will be celebrated by classrooms daily. - Classroom Teacher

Attendance will be monitored by grade level weekly. - Social Worker

Schoolwide attendance will be celebrated monthly. - Asst. Principal

Person Responsible: Kara Griffin (kgriffin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Over the course of the school year.

Attendance will be celebrated by classrooms daily. - Classroom Teacher
 Attendance will be monitored by grade level weekly. - Social Worker
 Schoolwide attendance will be celebrated monthly. - Asst. Principal

Person Responsible: Kara Griffin (kgriffin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Over the course of the school year.

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

#6. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Grades K/1 Area of Focus will be phonemic awareness and all additional foundational skills. Students are arriving in Kindergarten with a high level of students not ready to learn. Using Dibels and STAR

assessments we are able to determine the distinct need for more foundational teachings in our lower grades.

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

Grades 3-5 students were far below the 50% threshold for proficiency as a school. 3rd grade students were approx 32% proficient, far below in ELA for grade level proficiency based on the FAST assessment for ELA.

All 3-5 grade levels including sub groups did not perform to expectations for their grade level.

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

In grades K/1 we expect 100 percent of students to be able to read at grade level by the 24-25 school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our goal for the 23-24 school year is to have at least 62 % of our students proficient in ELA with subgroups performing at minimum at the 50% proficiency mark.

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.

We will be monitoring data during all assessment periods to ensure we are progressing to our impact goals for the year. We will analyze, reflect and plan for intervention during our grade level PLC times. Data sheets will be developed for teachers based on FAST assessment results so teachers, with support, can determine where the needs of the students lie and how they should be addressed. Dibels data will be made available for Primary teachers to analyze where the greatest need is for instruction at the T2 and T3 levels. Student groups will be formed to address the deficits.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Thomas, Ellen, ethomas@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?

Grades K/1 will be trained to utilize UFLI for foundational work beginning the second quarter of the 23/24 school year. Our students come to Kindergarten typically with only about 50% Ready for instruction. Phonemic awareness and sounds are well below the expectation of a student entering school. This makes it difficult to close the gap by first grade. Therefore we have decided to implement the UFLI foundational program beginning the 2nd quarter of the 23/24 school year.

In grades 3-5 we will utilize the HMH curriculum for Tier 1 instruction. For Tiers 2 and 3 we use SIPPS- <https://www.collaborativeclassroom.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Effectiveness-of-SIPPSfor-Students-with-Dyslexia.pdf>, Lexia Core5- <https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/reading/lexia-core5r-reading-program-struggling-readers>.

We utilize a District provided Literacy Framework that includes a dedicated, uninterrupted block of 90 minutes

for all students. The framework details how many instructional minutes are allotted for Foundational Skills, Comprehension and Vocabulary, Small Group Differentiated Instruction, and Writing. This Framework also includes the instructional materials to be utilized during each component of the Literacy Block and suggested Teacher and Student Actions.

SIPPS-<https://www.collaborativeclassroom.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Effectiveness-of-SIPPSfor-Students-with-Dyslexia.pdf>, Lexia Core5- <https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/reading/lexia-core5r-reading-program-struggling-readers>.

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?

Grades K/1 will be trained to utilize UFLI for foundational work beginning the second quarter of the 23/24 school year. UFLI Foundations is an explicit and systematic program that teaches students the foundational skills necessary for proficient reading. It follows a carefully developed scope and sequence designed to ensure that students systematically acquire each skill needed and learn to apply each skill with automaticity and confidence. The program is designed to be used for core instruction in the primary grades or for intervention with struggling students in any grade. UFLI aligns with the District K-12 reading plan and the BEST ELA Standards.

SIPPS and Lexia were selected by District to meet the needs of our struggling readers when implemented with fidelity. Lexia is a skill based program that provides a teacher with information to assist the student in lessons that may help a skill the student is struggling with to improve their overall reading.

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
Overall response to Interventions: Literacy Leadership - Will assist with assessment and disseminating the data. Literacy Coaching will provide insight to teacher need and feedback to teacher on best practices. Coaches will attend content and coaching PD to provide them with the expertise needed to improve proficiency schoolwide. Assessment will be utilized to gage progress and to reflect upon to monitor instructional practice. Professional Development will be planned based on walk through data look fors and overall needs of instructional practice of teachers.	Thomas, Ellen, ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us
Provide Professional Development for UFLI and monitor the implementation of the program to insure execution and fidelity. Literacy Coach and Literacy Leaders will assist with monitoring the classroom instructional practice of UFLI.	Thomas, Ellen, ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us
Professional Development in BEST Standards for ELA for all Reading teachers. Contact SLDRs for RAISE schools to provide support.	Thomas, Ellen, ethomas@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.

The SIP is found on the school and district website aes.pasco.k12.fl.us. A copy of the SIP is also housed in a binder in the front office of the school.

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))

The Family Engagement Plan for Anclote Elementary School can be found on the school website at aes.pasco.k12.fl.us. In addition, a friendly version will be sent home in the first day folder to each student's parent. We will also hold events at the school to build positive relationships with parents and community members. Our school also houses an open playground for the neighborhood children that is available after school and on weekends during daylight hours.

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 plan to strengthen our academic program through the hiring of certified teachers, professional development aligned to the new benchmarks and engagement structures for the classroom. With these three critical areas addressed in the classroom and monitored voraciously we expect a much higher level of student proficiency. In addition, we are beginning an accelerated math curriculum offering in third grade. This will be the first step in an accelerated program that will increase by one grade level each year until fully implemented in the 25-26 school year.

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))

By strengthening our academic program as detailed above, we believe we will see an increase in proficient students in our underperforming sub groups.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment:	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment:	\$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