Moon Lake Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Moon Lake Elementary School

12019 TREE BREEZE DR, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://mles.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.

We will be a community of learners striving for excellence in all we do.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Moon Lake Elementary, we will motivate, lead, educate and support every child, every day to help them achieve success in college, career and life.

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
Landahl, Elise	Principal	Part of development, implementation and monitoring of the SIP
Freda, Clare	Behavior Specialist	Help develop, implement and monitor around behavior data
Henry, Cori	Teacher, K-12	Work with team to implement and monitor our academic data and implementation of Conscious Discipline
Maltese, Andrea	Instructional Coach	monitors data and supports teachers in the implementation
Middleton, Celeste	Teacher, ESE	monitor and implement SIP goals in ESE
Toncich, Michael	Assistant Principal	Develop, monitor and implement SIP

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

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

We ask for staff input and SLT as we develop our goals and strategies. We also use parent survey data and get input from our SAC.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We will work with our SLT to monitor our progress on our goals and adjust as needed.

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	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	74%
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: 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	37	26	35	45	29	24	0	0	0	196
One or more suspensions	10	2	1	12	2	4	0	0	0	31
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	46	29	26	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	47	30	33	0	0	0	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	4	2	0	19	12	11	0	0	0	48

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	2	0	1	11	1	1	0	0	0	16
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	31	32	30	22	27	23	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	6	5	7	4	4	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	7	35	44	12	6	8	0	0	0	112
Course failure in Math	3	18	37	22	6	57	0	0	0	143
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	22	33	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	42	23	40	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	16	13	26	43	25	39	0	0	0	162

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	1	8	12	5	1	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	1	11	0	1	0	0	0	18
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	31	32	30	22	27	23	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	6	5	7	4	4	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	7	35	44	12	6	8	0	0	0	112
Course failure in Math	3	18	37	22	6	57	0	0	0	143
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	22	33	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	42	23	40	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	16	13	26	43	25	39	0	0	0	162

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	1	8	12	5	1	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	1	11	0	1	0	0	0	18
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*	37	47	53	37	52	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				57			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			27		
Math Achievement*	38	48	59	43	46	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				66			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			29		
Science Achievement*	41	50	54	41	50	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	56	61	59	57			60		

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	202
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	18	Yes	2	1
ELL	21	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	1	
FRL	34	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	57			

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%
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	49			

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	37			38			41					56
SWD	15			21			25				4	
ELL	0			7							3	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			44							3	
HSP	28			28			36				5	57
MUL	53			47							2	
PAC												
WHT	38			40			45				4	
FRL	29			32			32				5	53

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	37	57	57	43	66	50	41					57
SWD	14	38	50	31	49	27	20					
ELL	30	60		40	70							57
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	13	42		20	46							
HSP	35	71		39	81		55					60
MUL	33	73		33	67							
PAC												
WHT	39	53	50	46	65	48	42					
FRL	35	61	61	39	63	48	32					54

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	35	32	27	30	30	29	40					60
SWD	19	12	8	20	19	20	16					
ELL	6			13								60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			16								
HSP	19	25		20	27		29					
MUL	13			6								
PAC												
WHT	41	33	27	35	29	18	43					
FRL	31	30	27	28	26	30	32					62

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	43%	51%	-8%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	58%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	29%	48%	-19%	50%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	32%	50%	-18%	59%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	54%	-1%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	52%	-7%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	49%	-9%	51%	-11%

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 proficiency in both ELA and math as shown on the FAST data for 3rd grade. We have had turnover with teachers in that grade level which caused a lack of classroom management leading to not a full year of achievement. 3rd grade has struggled for the past two years. We

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

We did not have a decline in proficiency across our overall ELA and Math achievement, however, it only increase by a percentage point or two. We are working to have strong structures in place to track the data and make sure to be intentional with our interventions and core instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our ELA proficiency had the biggest gap overall and our 3rd grade gap was 24% difference which pulled our overall proficiency down. Our 3rd grade team was working on coming together as a team and needed more learning with the Best standards and intentional planning.

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

Our 4th grade math proficiency was the same as the state and had improved from the previous year. Our 4th grade math teachers worked to intentionally plan for core and interventions.

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

Our biggest area of concern is our Level 1 on the statewide assessment in ELA and Math. We are working to monitor and be intentional with our planning around our Core and interventions to address those gaps.

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

1) Increase our overall ELA proficiency especially in 3rd grade. 2) Increase our overall math proficiency especially in 3rd grade. 3) Strengthen our structures and routines in the classrooms and school so the students can focus on their learning.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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

In analyzing our ELA and math data from the FAST assessment, we want to increase our achievement in those areas by strengthening our intentional planning and instructional practices around the ELA and Math BEST standards.

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

85% of our students will make at least 1 years growth between FAST PM1 and FAST PM3

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

We will review the data from the FAST progress monitoring in ELA and Math as well as our HMH module assessments & DIBELS in ELA and Eureka Module assessments in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elise Landahl (elandahl@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.)

During PLCs, unpacking the BEST standards in math & ELA and applying that knowledge with our Eureka & HMH curriculum through professional development, collaborative planning and instructional coaching.

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

The tier 1 curriculum has been selected for our district based on the new Florida legislation around selecting appropriate materials.

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.

After administering the FAST PM1 to all students on campus, we will facilitate data analysis at each grade level to determine needs based on standards and make adjustments to tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Michael Toncich (mtoncich@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: After all the Data is in from the first window of FAST assessments which is the end of the 1st quarter.

#2. 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.

Improve and refine the school wide systems around resiliency standards, focusing on incorporating key pieces from Conscious Discipline school wide.

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

The number of office discipline referrals will decrease across grade levels by 10%

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

Our Conscious Discipline Action Team will monitor the use of Conscious Discipline structures across the school. Our MTSS Behavior Committee will meet once per quarter to review data and problem solve where
needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Toncich (mtoncich@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.)

Conscious Discipline is a science based philosophy that focuses on teaching skills and creating connection. Students learn about their different brain states and use tools to self regulate. These skills will give them the tools to become resilient members of society.

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

The students on our campus that were struggling with behavior continued to struggle each year without much improvement. We selected Conscious Discipline due to the success other schools were having, the science based research it was based on, and the focus around self regulation and resiliency.

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.

Our CDAT team will meet monthly to review monitoring data around Conscious Discipline structures being used across campus. MTSS Behavior committee will meet quarterly to review data around behavior school wide and problem solve any areas that are struggling.

Person Responsible: Elise Landahl (elandahl@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly starting in September 2023

#3. 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 students with disabilities have struggled with increasing their academic achievement. We want to focus on finding and implementing instructional strategies and tools to have them increase their acheivement.

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

Our SWD will increase their proficiency in ELA and math from the FAST PM1 to PM3 by 20%.

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

We will review the data from the FAST progress monitoring in ELA and Math as well as our HMH module assessments in ELA and Eureka Module assessments in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elise Landahl (elandahl@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.)

Through the implementation of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on our student data, the ESE teacher and classroom teacher will work together to design the instruction to close the gap. During our PLCs, we will discuss the data, plan groups and instruction and monitor their response.

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

By working together as a team with the ESE teacher and classroom teacher, we will be able to monitor their growth and increase their achievement.

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.

Our SLT will monitor our SWD data on assessments and problem solve. As well as discuss at WATCH team and SIT meetings.

Person Responsible: Michael Toncich (mtoncich@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly throughout the 2023 2024 school year

#4. 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.

Our African American students have struggled with increasing their student achievement. We want to focus on finding and implementing instructional strategies and tools to have them increase their achievement.

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

Our African American students will increase their proficiency in ELA and math from the FAST PM1 to PM3 by 20%.

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

We will review the data from the FAST progress monitoring in ELA and Math as well as our HMH module assessments in ELA and Eureka Module assessments in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Toncich (mtoncich@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.)

Through the implementation of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on our student data, our instructional coaches and classroom teachers will work together to design the instruction to close the gap. During our PLCs, we will discuss the data, plan groups and instruction and monitor their response.

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

By working together as a team with the coaches and classroom teacher, we will be able to monitor their growth and increase their achievement.

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.

Our SLT will monitor the assessment data for this subgroup and develop action plans as needed to be shared with their PLC and teachers.

Person Responsible: Elise Landahl (elandahl@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly throughout the 2023 2024 school year

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

In looking at our STAR Literacy, DIBELS and Formative assessments, the area of greatest need for grade K-2 is
foundational skills. Foundational skills are the key component to future readers and focusing on these areas will allow students to be successful at higher grade levels. Since many of our intermediate students struggle with comprehension, we hypothesis that the reason is a difficulty decoding, which would improve with their foundational skills.

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

In looking at our FAST, DIBELS and Formative assessments, the greatest area of need in grade 3-5 is in the area of comprehension. Our students fall into two categories: students that are struggling with comprehension due to a deficit in foundational skills and those who are struggling with comprehension at its core. Based on that information, we will tailor interventions to both groups during interventions and provide tier 1 and 2 support as needed for new standards.

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

Each grade level K-2, will increase their overall proficiency by 10% on the FAST assessment given 3 times per year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Each grade level, 3-5 will increase their overall proficiency by 15% on the FAST assessment given 3 times per year.

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 monitor our progress at each grade level using the state's progress monitoring system (FAST), individual DIBELS assessments and formative classroom assessments. Teacher teams and support staff will meet once per week to review data and discuss areas of need.

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

Landahl, Elise, elandahl@pasco.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We will implement the following practices and programs, all which have been approved by the state: HMH,
SIPPS, Lexia Core 5, Haggerty, and DIBELS.

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?

Our district identifies, reviews and adopts all curriculum and programs for our district.

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
Literacy Leadership - Our lead literacy committee will meet quarterly and review data, analyze trends across grade levels and the school and problem solve when needed.	Maltese, Andrea, amaltese@pasco.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching - We hired another literacy coach that will focus on K-2nd grade and our current literacy coach will focus on 3rd-5th grade. Coaching around all aspects of literacy instruction will be available to all teachers on campus who need it. Teachers may reach out and request that coaching or coaches might observe and provide feedback that leads to coaching. Coaching will also take place in planning session around creating and implementing lessons and using data to respond in the classroom	Maltese, Andrea, amaltese@pasco.k12.fl.us
Assessment - Teachers will meet weekly to analyze assessment data from all sources and problem solve around areas of need. Teachers will also create intervention groups to provide additional instruction based on that data.	Toncich, Michael, mtoncich@pasco.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning - Teachers will participate in professional learning communities once per week in addition to the professional development will will offer as a school around the resources we are implementing. There will also be opportunities for teachers to participate in district professional learning as needed or requested.	Landahl, Elise, elandahl@pasco.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We have our SIP linked to our webpage once the SIP is approved. Here is the webpage it will be on: https://mles.pasco.k12.fl.us/
We also share our SIP and Title One plan and the progress throughout the year with our SAC as well as at our Annual Title One meeting.

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 will be on our website at https://mles.pasco.k12.fl.us/
We send out weekly messages from the school through MyStudent and grade level teams will be sending out weekly communications through MyStudent about what they are working on. We will offer various Family events throughout the school year to share information regarding curriculum, strategies and tools that families can utilize to help their children make growth in their academics and behavior.

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 are working with our instructional coaches and our PLCs to intentionally plan for student learning and monitor the data to make adjustments as needed. We will also work with our SLT, CDAT (Conscious Discipline Action Team) and SIT (School Intervention Team) to monitor the data of all our students especially our subgroups that aren't meeting the federal index which are our SWD and African American students.

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

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning**	$0.00
2	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other**	$0.00
3	III.B.	**Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	$0.00
4	III.B.	**Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American**	$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.

Yes