Pine View Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pine View Middle School

5334 PARKWAY BLVD, Land O Lakes, FL 34639

https://pvms.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.

Our mission is to provide a rigorous, world-class education which inspires students to become active, compassionate, and collaborative lifelong learners who understand and respect other people and their differences.

The International Baccalaureate® aims to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect.

To this end the organization works with schools, governments and international organizations to develop challenging programmes of international education and rigorous assessment.

These programmes encourage students across the world to become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our mission is to provide a rigorous, world-class education which inspires students to become active, compassionate, and collaborative lifelong learners who understand and respect other people and their differences.

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
Warren, Jennifer	Principal	Supervises all activities of the school with the assistance of administration and school leadership team.
Leary, Alicia	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal, especially in matters related to mathematics education and exceptional student education.
Vollstedt, Taryn	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal, especially in matters related to English Language Arts and Reading education.
Williams, Steve	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal, especially in matters related to social studies education.
Cardinale, Rebecca	Magnet Coordinator	Coordinates all aspects of the IB MYP Programme and provides professional development and PLC support to teachers.
Ippolito, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Serves on the school leadership team and provides direct instruction to students, as well as instructional support and coaching to teachers on her team.
Myers, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Serves on the school leadership team and provides direct instruction to students, as well as instructional support and coaching to teachers on her team.
Polk, Raisa	Teacher, K-12	Serves on the school leadership team and provides direct instruction to students, as well as instructional support and coaching to teachers on her team.

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

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

The school's leadership team reviews the school improvement plan annually to analyze data and provide guidance on instructional decision making. The School Advisory Committee also reviews the plan annually with data to provide feedback and guidance.

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))

Professional Learning Communities gather and analyze data ongoing to develop tiers of support for learners. Data is also reviewed quarterly and shared with staff for reflection and action planning.

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	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
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	45	50	61	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	53	61	162
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	20	76
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	65	45	125
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	54	86	182
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	73	65	228
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	

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	54	73	68	195

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	4	4
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	33	24	50	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	28	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course Failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	55	55	129
Level 1 on 2021 Statewide ELA or Math Assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	51	65	145

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	18	35	54	107

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	33	24	50	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	28	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course Failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	55	55	129
Level 1 on 2021 Statewide ELA or Math Assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	51	65	145

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	18	35	54	107

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*	53	48	49	52	46	50	52		
ELA Learning Gains				45			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			32		
Math Achievement*	66	58	56	64	34	36	64		
Math Learning Gains				68			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			52		
Science Achievement*	59	46	49	62	54	53	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	70	68	82	59	58	79		
Middle School Acceleration	52	60	73	61	50	49	55		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					72	70			
ELP Progress	19	35	40	60	65	76	41		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	2	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	51			
HSP	48			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	45			

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	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	51			
HSP	53			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	51			

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	53			66			59	74	52			19
SWD	20			33			15	49			4	
ELL	31			45			38	50			5	19
AMI												
ASN	72			82			67		90		4	
BLK	40			52			50	60			4	
HSP	43			56			51	74	49		6	14
MUL	61			62			72	73			4	
PAC												
WHT	57			70			62	75	53		5	
FRL	45			54			42	69	35		6	27

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	52	45	33	64	68	57	62	82	61			60
SWD	17	27	27	25	51	51	29	41				
ELL	33	35	25	48	59	44	29	71				60
AMI												
ASN	70	50		82	77		78	90	73			
BLK	43	44	36	51	65	59	41	86	38			
HSP	44	39	24	56	64	50	52	80	58			58
MUL	59	54		65	72	60	68	88	85			
PAC												
WHT	55	47	39	68	69	59	67	82	59			
FRL	40	41	34	49	63	58	42	70	49			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	52	45	32	64	58	52	58	79	55			41
SWD	20	28	22	26	45	46	27	50				
ELL	34	43	37	40	51	52	40	68				41
AMI												
ASN	71	67		70	58			93	82			
BLK	42	55	54	52	55	58	38	77	25			
HSP	40	38	37	54	51	47	45	70	40			47
MUL	54	43		68	56		36	86				
PAC												
WHT	57	45	24	69	62	57	66	81	60			
FRL	35	33	28	44	50	49	38	65	34			

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	52%	48%	4%	47%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	46%	1%	47%	0%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	46%	7%	47%	6%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	51%	54%	-3%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	48%	11%	48%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	67%	13%	55%	25%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	58%	46%	12%	44%	14%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	50%	50%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	65%	*	63%	*

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	70%	4%	66%	8%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Our ESE subgroup continues to be our focus group with the greatest opportunity for growth. Designing and providing tiers of support to match the need of individual learners continues to be a focus area of growth for both ELA and Math.

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

Achieving consistent and sustained gains for ELA and Math FAST data continues to be areas of focus. Designing and providing tiers of support to match the need of individual learners continues to be a focus area of growth for our school.

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.

Data not available at time of plan development, but consistently our pattern has been that our ESE learners are not meeting the state average in all subject areas.

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

ELA continues to show steady gains in course pass rates and some achievement areas. Flex Days were implemented as an intervention to provide time for tiers of instruction to occur within the classroom setting. Second change learning opportunities are provided consistently to provide students multiple opportunities to re-take assessments to show improvement of their mastery of the standards.

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

Even though course failure data looks favorable for ELA, the resulting outcomes on FAST assessments do not correlate entirely for all learners. We will continue to look at second chance learning opportunities that lead to improved student outcomes that are measurable and aligned to the standards.

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

Increasing learning outcomes for ESE learners throughout all grade levels to increase Reading and Math achievement.

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 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.

Our ESE population performs below the target. This is our only subgroup that performs below the target and therefore our focus. We will consistently implement Lexia to support literacy growth in ESE learners.

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

Our ESE subgroup will make gains of 5% annually on FAST assessment data.

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

Reading and ELA teachers will implement and monitor Lexia data to monitor for growth. They will implement with strategies to encourage active engagement and engagement with fidelity.
PLCs will monitor data sources ongoing to provide tiers of instruction to respond to individual student needs. Flex Days will be consistently implemented to provide structured time for interventions to occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Taryn Vollstedt (tvollste@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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

Lexia's science of reading-based solutions are founded upon a structured, explicit, and systematic approach to literacy and language instruction that builds upon prior learning in a sequential manner—from simple to complex—ultimately improving each teacher's ability to deliver critical literacy concepts, strengthening a student's relationship with learning, and transitioning ownership of learning to that student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lexia is centered around a personalized approach to learning, and is designed to give students more control over the time, place, path, and pace of their progress.

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.

Schedule PLC time for teachers to plan implementation and monitor outcome data to adjust the plan as needed.

Person Responsible: Taryn Vollstedt (tvollste@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

Student mastery of the standards while engaging in rigorous coursework is essential to student success. Our focus will be on second change learning opportunities using Edmentum as a support to providing tiers of instruction to help students master standards.

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

Student achievement measured by the FAST Math and ELA assessment will increase by 5% annually.

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

ELA, Math, and other subject area teachers will use Edmentum for second change learning opportunities. They will review and analyze data to monitor for growth and additional intervention.
PLCs will monitor data sources ongoing to provide tiers of instruction to respond to individual student needs. Flex Days will be consistently implemented to provide structured time for interventions to occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alicia Leary (aleary@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.)

Edmentum offers the depth, breadth, and flexibility to support teacher-led classroom instruction and effective virtual and blended solutions. Students only work on what they need to with engaging, scaffolded instruction to keep students motivated to recover skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Edmentum offers standards based recovery for multiple subjects. This allows students to use the software across many subject areas with familiarity and ease of use. Edmentum meets students where they are and focuses on skills students need to recover to work toward mastery of the standards.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Schedule PLC time for teachers to plan implementation and monitor outcome data to adjust the plan as needed.

Person Responsible: Alicia Leary (aleary@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

Our use of PBIS to focus on attendance, grade and behavior will help to create a positive culture and climate in our school.

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

Student engagement, as measured by the Gallup survey will increase by 2% from the previous year.

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

Teacher use of PBIS points to reinforce positive choices will be monitored by our SIT team. Also, students using PBIS points will also monitored to ensure that reinforcers match student interests. Student attendance and need for behavior intervention will also be monitored.

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.)

Through PBIS implementation, we will engage our school-wide community to establish a climate where everyone feels welcome and seen. When schools implement PBIS, teachers, students, and their families all perceive their school's climate more positively.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Establishing school-wide expectations with our students sets the tone for the classroom. When we spend time getting to know our students and use strategies to deepen connections every day, we are building a healthy classroom environment. When students have clear expectations, are regularly acknowledged for the things they do well, and receive instructional consequences more often than exclusionary ones, they are going to spend more time in class than out of it. This all leads to students who are more engaged in instruction.

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.

Schedule PLC and SIT time for teachers to plan implementation and monitor outcome data to adjust the plan as needed.

Person Responsible: Steve Williams (scwillia@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When:

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.