Calusa Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Calusa Elementary School

7520 ORCHID LAKE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34653

https://caes.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.

Calusa Elementary School fosters and promotes a safe, positive, and compassionate school environment that cultivates personal excellence for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Calusa Elementary School will create a community for all Pasco students to reach their highest potential.

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
Hartman, Michelle	Principal	
Sutula, Tammy	Assistant Principal	
Oates, Kristin	Instructional Coach	
Marcel, Ginger	Instructional Coach	
Mantzarinis, Vivian	School Counselor	
Puckhaber, Dawn	Instructional Coach	
Grimmer, Andrew	Other	
Watkins, Marsha	Psychologist	
Staley, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Hicks, Patsy	Teacher, K-12	
Dunn, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Galante, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	
Ganaway, Cathy	Teacher, K-12	
Heatherly, Montia	Teacher, K-12	

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.

At Calusa Elementary, all stakeholders are represented and involved in a collaborative system of decision making to implement and improve student teaching and learning. The SIP is developed based

on input from our stakeholders.

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))

All stakeholders monitor progress and problem-solve around our SIP goals. Teams focus on attendance, referrals and academic outcomes throughout the school year.

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	87%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)* 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	28	27	26	23	22	24	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	7	7	3	2	5	6	0	0	0	30
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	16	26	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	25	27	0	0	0	61
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	

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	2	4	3	6	11	11	0	0	0	37

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	1	0	1	10	6	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	4	19	25	17	15	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	10
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	25	28	27	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	31	42	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course Failure	0	2	7	19	8	5	0	0	0	41

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	2	7	19	8	5	0	0	0	41

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	1	4	19	25	17	15	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	10
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	25	28	27	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	31	42	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course Failure	0	2	7	19	8	5	0	0	0	41

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	2	7	19	8	5	0	0	0	41

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*	29	47	53	36	52	56	27		
ELA Learning Gains				61			21		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69			29		
Math Achievement*	27	48	59	34	46	50	26		
Math Learning Gains				53			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			30		
Science Achievement*	22	50	54	40	50	59	24		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	61	59	69			39		

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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	155
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	16	Yes	1	1
ELL	29	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	28	Yes	1	1
MUL	20	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	30	Yes	1	1
FRL	29	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	3	
HSP	44			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	29			27			22					48
SWD	11			17							3	
ELL	19			19							3	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			42							2	
HSP	30			20		13					5	48
MUL	11			29							2	
PAC												
WHT	29			29			28				4	
FRL	27			26			20				5	45

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	36	61	69	34	53	40	40					69
SWD	17	68	79	15	50		30					
ELL	14	44		24	47							69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	65		21	41		18					
HSP	27	53	45	27	60	43	33					67
MUL	44	70		38								
PAC												
WHT	40	63	87	40	52	38	51					
FRL	33	57	63	32	50	40	40					68

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	27	21	29	26	28	30	24					39
SWD	8	13	20	5	20		0					
ELL	10			24								39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			13								
HSP	16	27		19	27		25					38
MUL	33			27								
PAC												
WHT	31	14		32	32		26					
FRL	21	19	29	20	21	28	17					33

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	29%	51%	-22%	54%	-25%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
03	2023 - Spring	27%	48%	-21%	50%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	24%	50%	-26%	59%	-35%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	54%	-19%	61%	-26%
05	2023 - Spring	25%	52%	-27%	55%	-30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	21%	49%	-28%	51%	-30%

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.

Areas of lowest performance include:
-34% of 5th graders were proficient on the 2022 FSA math
-21% of 5th graders were proficient on the 2022 FSA ELA

Contributing factors include:
-Achievement gaps impacted from academic years during COVID
-Teacher turnover in 5th grade
-Student attendance

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

Areas of greatest decline from prior year:
-5th grade scores on the Florida Science Assessment went from 36% proficient in 2022 to 21% proficient in 2023.

Contributing factors include:

-Achievement gaps impacted from academic years during COVID
-Teacher turnover in 5th grade
-Student attendance

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.

Greatest gap compared to state:
-Based on EOY 2023 FAST Math data, CAES 5th graders scale score average was 304, state average was 321

Contributing factors include:
-Achievement gaps impacted from academic years during COVID
-Teacher turnover in 5th grade
-Student attendance

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

Area of most improvement:
-4th Grade FAST ELA Data - 2023 BOY 9% proficient, EOY 31% proficient

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

Areas of concern based on EWS data:
-Absence percentages for all grades range from 22-28%
-Number of level 1s on state assessments for ELA is 52 and Math is 61

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

-Teachers will intentionally plan and execute standards-focused, rigorous learning experiences through all content areas to improve proficiencies and learning gains
-Attendance and behavior will be closely monitored by the SIT and SLT to intervene and problem-solve

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

CAES school family will create common language and systems that support and promote high levels of learning for all students, including low performing subgroups ELL and Blk.
•Staff will provide a safe and connected learning environment for all (morning welcoming routines and rituals, Brain Smart Start, visual schedules and Safe Place)
• Staff will identify, intervene & monitor attendance, behavior & social/emotional needs
• Staff will increase parent/family engagement opportunities to build home-school connection
• Staff will engage in committees to promote a cohesive and positive culture of learners (ELA, Math, PBIS/Behavior, Sunshine)
• Staff will promote and engage students in reading and writing throughout all content areas

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

-Attendance will improve a minimum of 8% from last year to current year.
-Student referrals will decrease a minimum of 10% from last year to current year.

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

SLT and SIT team will monitor student outcomes (academic, attendance and behavior).

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.)

-Weekly School Intervention Team meetings to monitor, problem-solve and intervene (academic, attendance and behavior).
-Tier II and Tier III in both math and reading will be implemented with fidelity based on need

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

-MTSS structures will be in place to provide supports to students showing need in the areas of math, reading, behavior, social/emotional.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

CAES school family will intentionally plan and execute standards-focused, rigorous learning experiences throughout all content areas.
• Grade level teams will utilize the PLC guiding questions and the IPG tool in order to design meaningful and rigorous learning experiences for all
• Teachers will provide students specific and relevant feedback in a timely manner
• Teachers and staff will implement a multisensory learning environment to increase engagement
• Tiered interventions will be designed, implemented and monitored following the tiered outline with fidelity
• Teachers will implement with fidelity the academic commitments in all subject areas

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

-Student outcomes in both ELA and math will improve to 41% proficiencies based on FAST assessment.

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

-Ongoing progress monitoring will be in place for Tier I, II and III
-Digital data binders will be monitored by SLT and SIT teams
-Individual and team data chats will occur quarterly

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Hartman (thartman@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.)

-Weekly School Intervention Team meetings to monitor, problem-solve and intervene (academic, attendance and behavior).
-Tier II and Tier III in both math and reading will be implemented with fidelity based on need
-Grade level teams will be planning closely with academic coaches
-Teams will follow the 4 PLC guiding questions to facilitate their work

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

-Noted strategies are best practices and supported by district protocols

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

-Teacher is strategically monitoring/checking for understanding throughout the lesson and providing immediate feedback
-Teacher providing opportunities for collaboration to deepen understanding
Students have the opportunity to collaborate, go back and revise thinking and/or citing multiple sources
-ELA-Students should be engaged in text throughout the majority of the lesson (Echo/choral, independent and/or partner reading) What were students doing? Or not observed

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

-Teacher is strategically monitoring/checking for understanding throughout the lesson and providing immediate feedback
-Teacher providing opportunities for collaboration to deepen understanding
Students have the opportunity to collaborate, go back and revise thinking and/or citing multiple sources
-ELA-Students should be engaged in text throughout the majority of the lesson (Echo/choral, independent and/or partner reading) What were students doing? Or not observed

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

According to the end of the year DIBELs, 52% of CAES Kindergarten students reached proficiency. Our goal for this cohort, current 1st graders, will increase to 57% on the end of the year DIBELs.

According to the end of the year DIBELs, 42% of CAES 1st grade students reached proficiency. Our goal for this cohort, current 2nd graders, will increase to 47% on the end of the year DIBELs.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to the end of the year DIBELs, 53% of CAES 2nd grade students reached proficiency. Our goal for this cohort, current 3rd graders, will increase to 58% on the end of the year DIBELs.

According to the end of the year FSA, 26% of CAES 3rd grader students reached proficiency. Our goal for this cohort, current 4th graders will increase to 41% on the end of the year FAST assessment.

According to the end of the year FSA, 31% of CAES 4th grader students reached proficiency. Our goal for this cohort, current 5th graders will increase to 41% on the end of the year FAST assessment.

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.

-Monitor TIII intervention student outcomes through grade level SIT
-Monitor classroom assessment data (ELA and math module assessments) in PLCs and SIT
-Monitor Renaissance Early Literacy and FAST assessments (BOY, MOY, EOY)

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hartman, Michelle, thartman@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?

Calusa Elementary has identified 2 levers, key focus areas, to implement consistently and pervasively across all grade levels to achieve the measurable outcomes. We used 22-23 student data, Success Plan, Core Actions/IPG, and John Hattie's Barometer of Influence research.

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?

The practices/programs include standards-aligned curriculum and assessment resources, Core Actions/IPG and MTSS systems of support. All address direct expectations and need for students.

Based on the FSA data, learning gains showed outcomes, which correlate to our strong tiers of instruction.

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
-Grade level teams will utilize the PLC guiding questions and the IPG tool in order to design meaningful and rigorous learning experiences for all. -SLT will identify, intervene and progress monitor school-wide Tier I and Tier II systems for effectiveness. -SIT will monitor the fidelity of Tier III using the COILE and problem-solve targeted supports.	Hartman, Michelle, thartman@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 will be articulated, monitored and adjusted with all the stakeholders throughout the year. We will post on our school web page and staff will reflect towards the goals during the school year.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We promote a positive culture and environment at Calusa. Our Sunshine Committee plans and executes staff activities, events, celebrations as well as support with personal emergencies. We have staff recognition and celebration traditions in place that promote a supportive, loving and fun working environment. We also create multiple opportunities throughout the year to inform families on their child's education and ways to engage and support them at home.

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))

The SLT team will conduct ongoing walkthroughs to monitor our Success Plan. We will identify based on trends area of growth as well as areas to celebrate. The SLT and SIT team will also monitor all students are progressing and meeting their individual needs through progress monitoring and goal setting.

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))

We follow district and state educational guidelines. We teach to the Florida BEST standards and monitor student progress through statewide assessments.

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))

Calusa Elementary School fosters and promotes a safe, positive and compassionate school environment that cultivates excellence in every student. Calusa implements Conscious Discipline as our SEL framework. All classes incorporate daily SEL activities to enhance social and emotional learning. We have highly engaged Student Services Team that provides ongoing support to students, staff and families. We are a PBIS school with many student celebrations in place that promote progress and success with academics, behavior and leadership. Our school has an "all hands on deck" approach to the needs of our students. We value our collaborative team structures and welcome innovative ideas and solutions to any challenges from all stakeholders.

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))

Students at Calusa Elementary participate in multiple opportunities visiting and engaging with our neighboring schools, Wendell Krinn Technical High School and Marchman Technical College. Students are introduced and exposed to the technical opportunities offered at the post-secondary level.

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).

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a framework we follow for integrating levels (or tiers) of academic and behavior support to promote the success of all students. We implement many universal screeners to identify student needs. The ultimate goal of a MTSS is to provide high-quality instruction and degree of support each student needs to be successful. Our collaborative teams (PLCs, SLT, and SIT) work together identifying student needs, monitoring student progress, analyzing student outcomes, problem-solving challenges and designing instructional opportunities.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

We offer ongoing professional development opportunities to all of our staff. Our academic coaches, administration, and district supports identify, design and implement learning opportunities in order to improve student achievement.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

We work closely with other schools and district personnel to provide a smooth transition from early childhood programs to Calusa Elementary. We ensure students are setup with supports and services needed based on individual IEPs, 504s or instructional recommendations.