# Sanders Memorial Elementary School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Sanders Memorial Elementary School

### 5126 SCHOOL RD, Land O Lakes, FL 34638

### https://smes.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: <ol><li>Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;</li><li>Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;</li><li>Have a school grade of D or F; or</li><li>Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.</li></ol> |

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.**

Inspiring Today's Leaders for Tomorrow's World

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Sanders Memorial Five Core Design Principles
Our Design Principles will be incorporated into every aspect of the Sanders Memorial's operation and will support the advancement of teaching and learning for all students.
• Students first: Decisions will be made with the students in mind.
• Positive relationships lead to positive outcomes: Relationships within our school community are pivotal to our students' success.
• Learners have voice and choice: Empowering learners to take part in designing their experiences.
• Failing Forward: Building perseverance and grit will be key to learning.
• Changing the World through Design: Students learn by engineering solutions to real world problems.

## 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 |
|------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Petry, Jason | Principal | |
| Hedgspeth, Kim | Assistant Principal | |

### 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 leadership team, PLC, and our SIT team came together to determine the goals.

### 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 are monitoring the goals of our SIP plan using academic data points from the FAST Assessments and DIBELS.

## 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** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 31% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 19% |
| **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)* 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |
| **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 | 17 | 12 | 14 | 24 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 4 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 21 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |

**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 | 17 | 17 | 12 | 15 | 23 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |

**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 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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 | 4 | 18 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 15 | 5 | 13 | 37 | 36 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |

**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 | 20 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |

**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 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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 | 4 | 18 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 15 | 5 | 13 | 37 | 36 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |

**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 | 20 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |

**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* | 73 | 47 | 53 | 76 | 52 | 56 | 76 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 68 | | | 43 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43 | | | 29 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 73 | 48 | 59 | 78 | 46 | 50 | 77 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 67 | | | 47 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56 | | | 23 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 76 | 50 | 54 | 68 | 50 | 59 | 59 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 54 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 38 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 44 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 61 | 59 | | | | | | |

*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 | 77 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 308 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 65 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 456 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| 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 | 49 | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 62 | | | |
| HSP | 71 | | | |
| MUL | 75 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | | | |
| FRL | 72 | | | |

| 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 | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 92 | | | |
| BLK | 61 | | | |
| HSP | 67 | | | |

| 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 | 67 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | | | |
| FRL | 64 | | | |

## 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 | 73 | | | 73 | | | 76 | | | | | |
| SWD | 50 | | | 38 | | | 41 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 67 | | | 56 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | 68 | | | 68 | | | 71 | | | | 4 | |
| MUL | 68 | | | 68 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | | | 75 | | | 76 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 64 | | | 69 | | | 77 | | | | 4 | |

| 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 | 76 | 68 | 43 | 78 | 67 | 56 | 68 | | | | | |
| SWD | 29 | 43 | 40 | 37 | 51 | 52 | 22 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 92 | | | 92 | | | | | | | | |

| **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 | 64 | | | 57 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 75 | 61 | | 74 | 47 | | 79 | | | | | |
| MUL | 81 | 60 | | 75 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 72 | 41 | 80 | 72 | 66 | 70 | | | | | |
| FRL | 75 | 75 | 33 | 78 | 64 | 58 | 63 | | | | | |

| **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 | 76 | 43 | 29 | 77 | 47 | 23 | 59 | | | | | |
| SWD | 28 | 36 | 29 | 36 | 29 | 22 | 30 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | 83 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | | | 44 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | 36 | | 70 | 50 | 30 | 48 | | | | | |
| MUL | 79 | | | 93 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 48 | 30 | 80 | 48 | 25 | 64 | | | | | |
| FRL | 70 | 41 | | 69 | 29 | | 47 | | | | | |

**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 | 77% | 51% | 26% | 54% | 23% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 55% | 14% | 58% | 11% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 84% | 48% | 36% | 50% | 34% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | * | 54% | * | 54% | * |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | * | 48% | * | 48% | * |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 81% | 50% | 31% | 59% | 22% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 54% | 14% | 61% | 7% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 79% | 52% | 27% | 55% | 24% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 76% | 49% | 27% | 51% | 25% |

## 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.**

Students with Disabilities is our lowest area. In 21-22 we had only 29 percent proficient in that subgroup for ELA. Only 43% percent of students made a leaning gain. FOr the 22-23 school year we increased to 39% of out SWD subgroup being profiicent in ELA.

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

Our data went up from 21-22. I attribute this to the use of explicit, systematic readings interventions.

**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.**

None

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

Our data went up from 21-22. I attribute this to the use of explicit, systematic readings interventions. We continue to build on this with acloser look at our Tier 1 and Tier 2 Instuctions and streamlining our systems for problem solving around students.

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

Attendance and 4th grade ELA/Math.

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

High Impact Instruction, Collaborative Culture and Data Driven Decision Making,

**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 focus is on Data driven decision across all three tiers of support. We will utilize the structures of our three main teams as a throughline to ensure all levels and all stakeholders are aligned with the goal and understand the vision.
SLT will focus on the implementation of our school-wide goals and school-wide priorities at the tier 1 level during our pre-determined monthly meetings. SLT will use tier 1 data, such as FAST, DIBELS, module assessments, and referral data to assess the health of our tier 1.

In PLCs, team leaders will ensure the implementation of school-wide action plans developed by the SLT. PLCs will utilize documents provided by the SIT team to determine student need for Tier 2 and tier 3. Tier 2 and tier 3 students will receive instruction and will be progress monitored using district approved resources. TBITs will occur bi-weekly using the SMES TBIT document. PLCs will develop and implement action plans based on grade level need.

The SIT team will provide professional development on the MTSS process using our SMES MTSS resources to develop a shared understanding for all instructional staff. The team will follow the district calendar to ensure the success of our tier 3 interventions.

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

50% of students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency in ELA and Math on PM3 FAST in 23-24. 60% of of students with disabilities will demonstrate learnign gains in ELA and Math on PM3 FAST in 23-24

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

We will monitor the implementation of the goal through meeting notes, temperature checks, and observations. We will monitor the desired outcomes using FAST Data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Kim Hedgspeth (kfoster@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.)

We are using research based best practices by using the structures of PLC, the School leadership team and the school intervention team to drive the implementation of MTSS at all three levels. When the teams are discussing the health of our tier 1 they are reflecting on the outcomes from district approved tier 2 resources, instructional practices and the quality of school provided professional developments across the whole school. PLCs use the above and reflect on the outcomes across the grade level. The PLC using the MTSS problem solving process to determine next steps for students needing more support. The SIT reflects on the quality and effectiveness of the tier 3 programs used across the school,.

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

This is what developed last year using stakeholder input and we saw gains. we are going to continue developing the systems and 3 teams across the school.

**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.

SLT will focus on the implementation of our school-wide goals and school-wide priorities at the tier 1 level during our pre-determined monthly meetings. SLT will use tier 1 data, such as FAST, DIBELS, module assessments, and referral data to assess the health of our tier 1.

In PLCs, team leaders will ensure the implementation of school-wide action plans developed by the SLT. PLCs will utilize documents provided by the SIT team to determine student need for Tier 2 and tier 3. Tier 2 and tier 3 students will receive instruction and will be progress monitored using district approved resources. TBITs will occur bi-weekly using the SMES TBIT document. PLCs will develop and implement action plans based on grade level need.

The SIT team will provide professional development on the MTSS process using our SMES MTSS resources to develop a shared understanding for all instructional staff. The team will follow the district calendar to ensure the success of our tier 3 interventions.

**Person Responsible:** Kim Hedgspeth (kfoster@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Throughout the year

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**

**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.

Collaborative Culture: Increase staff, student, and family involvement through delivery of engaging experiences directly related to our STEAM magnet theme.

Staff meetings will occur twice a month with a deliberate emphasis on building a positive culture and celebrating successes.

Staff Shoutouts via padlet, team of the month, Kagan class building structures, lollipop moments and recognizing staff within the house system.

Students will be celebrated for excellent behavior and academics monthly and quarterly. House Heroes, Super Stallions, and Stallion of the Quarter. Spin tickets will be used for PBIS along with badges in mystudent.

SMES will develop a family engagement committee that will use dual capacity building framework for family engagement.

Committees will include a staff culture club, academic in-school events, engaging in school events, Literacy, Math, and new teachers/Mentors to build culture across all school staff.

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

Employee engagement will show that a score of 4.4. We are currently at 4.37
The area of I understand how the organization's values impact
how I do my job will go from 4.15 to 4.39

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

Frequent employee surveys and open door opportunities for staff to communicate with ledaership.

**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.)

Staff meetings will occur twice a month with a deliberate emphasis on building a positive culture and celebrating successes.

Staff Shoutouts via padlet, team of the month, Kagan class building structures, lollipop moments and recognizing staff within the house system.

Students will be celebrated for excellent behavior and academics monthly and quarterly. House Heroes, Super Stallions, and Stallion of the Quarter. Spin tickets will be used for PBIS along with badges in mystudent.

SMES will develop a family engagement committee that will use dual capacity building framework for family engagement.

Committees will include a staff culture club, academic in-school events, engaging in school events, Literacy, Math, and new teachers/Mentors to build culture across all school staff.

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

Shared leadership is a proven way to increase stakeholder retention.

**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*

**#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

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

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

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

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

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

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

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

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

As a system, the Pasco district is engaging in a continuous improvement process always, and annually, we have a more focused reflection to look forward to the next coming school year. During the year, each school reflects and responds to data at the minimum quarterly, and the system engages in regular Calibration Meetings throughout the school year. Additionally, after reflecting on current mid-year data, the system engages in Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). During this time, each school enters a needs assessment process that sets the stage for future planning and includes analysis of student performance, analysis of stakeholder feedback, self-assessment, and site visits. Subsequently, this analysis from each school drives the district planning process and the annual approach to Planning Forward to respond our schools, as well as the allocation of resources in an intentional manner based on the needs identified for each school.

Student Performance is analyzed by reviewing current and trend data by subgroup and school. Data sources include Florida BEST assessments, Statewide Science Assessment, district developed quarterly check results where applicable, and NWEA MAP Growth data. Stakeholder feedback is analyzed by reviewing results from both the student and staff Gallup polls, staff and parent surveys and focus groups.

Multiple tools are used to conduct a self-assessment. Each school and the district use the Cognia Standards for systems accreditation and each school and the district reviews and evaluates its progress toward goals set using the Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE). Instructional Practice Observations, Professional Learning Community (PLC) rubrics, and Tiers of Support rubrics are also completed by each school to gain insight into instructional and support practices.

An Assistant Superintendent, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Specialist, and District personnel engage in individual site visits with school leadership at each school after the school team has completed the first part of their analysis to gain insight into the school's unique needs as well as identify foci for school improvement efforts and needs for implementing the plan.

The conclusion of the CNA results in the identification of the root causes of barriers, the development of a school improvement plan to overcome/reduce barriers to improvement, the allocation of supports needed to implement each school's improvement plan and serves as the foundation for Planning Forward. Schools analyze their plans and basic allocations that will be provided based on district formulas to determine needs for additional allocations, resources and supports. With the school assistant superintendent and the school support team, each school then carefully aligns the additional available funds through Title 1 and/or UniSIG to specific strategies for improvement aimed at reducing barriers to achievement and closing learning gaps for underperforming student groups. This plan for use of additional funding is regularly monitored by the district support team, and is adjusted based on data, including student progress monitoring results, as applicable through the year, with the support of the state BSI team and the Department.