

Pasco County Schools

Cypress Creek Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	13
III. Planning for Improvement	18
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Cypress Creek Middle School

8127 OLD PASCO RD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33544

<https://ccms.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.

H.O.W.L.

Have a growth Mindset
Own Your Education
Work as a Community
Lead Responsibly

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Cypress Creek Middle School, instructional practices relate to standards-aligned instruction to ensure all students demonstrate proficiency of the standards.

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
Light, Tim	Principal	<p>Organize and facilitate department PLC's.</p> <p>Responsible for supporting Tier 3 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Melsheimer, Meighan	Assistant Principal	<p>Organize and facilitate department PLC's.</p> <p>Responsible for supporting Tier 3 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Nieves, Kayla	Assistant Principal	<p>Organize and facilitate department PLC's.</p> <p>Responsible for supporting Tier 3 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Roberts, Erica	Assistant Principal	<p>Organize and facilitate department PLC's.</p> <p>Responsible for supporting Tier 3 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Carr, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	<p>Serve as Science Department Head.</p> <p>Organize and facilitate science department PLC's.</p> <p>Responsible for supporting Tier 2 teachers.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
McNaull, Michele	Teacher, K-12	<p>Serve as Math Department Head.</p> <p>Organize and facilitate math department PLC's.</p> <p>Responsible for supporting Tier 2 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Getz, Arielle	Teacher, K-12	<p>Serve as Social Studies Department Head.</p> <p>Organize and facilitate math department PLC's.</p> <p>Responsible for supporting Tier 2 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Santiago, Justin	Teacher, K-12	<p>Serve as ELA Department Head.</p> <p>Organize and facilitate math department PLC's.</p> <p>Responsible for supporting Tier 2 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Whaley , Tabatha	Teacher, K-12	Union Representative

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sauerwein, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Model Classroom for Classroom Management and Strategies
Neale, Joe	Instructional Coach	<p>Organize and facilitate department PLC's with supervising administrator Responsible for supporting Tier 3 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Robin, Kaitlyn	Instructional Coach	<p>Organize and facilitate department PLC's with supervising administrator Responsible for supporting Tier 3 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Scott, Tori	Instructional Coach	<p>Organize and facilitate department PLC's with supervising administrator Responsible for supporting Tier 3 teachers.</p> <p>Analyze and evaluate observation data to determine if instructional priorities have been achieved.</p> <p>Collaborate with school's leadership team to review prioritized instructional priorities from completed gap analysis.</p> <p>Determine new rationale, instructional priorities, and measurable outcomes based on gap analysis to further support the objective of achieving the school's area of focus of instructional practice relates to standards-aligned instruction.</p>
Troutt, Cecilia	Teacher, ESE	Serve as ESE support specialist.

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.

In the spring of the previous year, the school leadership team reviewed the administration's draft of the SIP that was created based on current student academic data. Based on their input, changes and

corrections were made to the document. The document was then presented to the School Advisory Council for their input and feedback. The document continued to remain in a draft format based on the feedback from all stakeholders throughout the summer. Over the summer, the administration reviewed all school and assessment data, and with the school's leadership team, they completed a gap analysis utilizing the resource made available by the Bureau of School Improvement. Based on the findings from this document, an area of focus was determined, a rationale developed, two instructional priorities identified, and a measurable outcome determined that align with the school district's three key priorities: High Impact Instruction, Data-Driven Decisions, and Collaborative Culture.

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))

A "Look For" monitoring tool has been developed for the current two Instructional priorities that the leadership team will utilize to observe teachers. Teachers have been tiered into three levels based on current data. A tiering schedule has been developed to create protected time for select members of the leadership team to conduct observations. Tier three teachers will have coaching cycles weekly, tier two teachers will have one observation per week with feedback, and tier one teacher will be on consult.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
School Improvement Rating History	

DJJ Accountability Rating History	
--	--

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	28	22	79	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	13	29	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	122	153	398	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	85	68	222	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	122	153	398	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	143	145	397

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	31	27	88	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	18	38	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course Failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	29	31	100	
Level 1 on 2021 Statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	41	63	116	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	25	29	64

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	31	27	88	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	18	38	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course Failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	29	31	100	
Level 1 on 2021 Statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	41	63	116	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	25	29	64

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*	50	48	49	53	46	50	57		
ELA Learning Gains				47			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			40		
Math Achievement*	66	58	56	63	34	36	60		
Math Learning Gains				67			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			31		
Science Achievement*	48	46	49	56	54	53	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	70	68	78	59	58	73		
Middle School Acceleration	68	60	73	69	50	49	57		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					72	70			
ELP Progress	43	35	40	41	65	76	52		

* 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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	52			
HSP	55			
MUL	58			
PAC				

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%
WHT	65			
FRL	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	48			
HSP	57			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	59			
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	50			66			48	74	68			43
SWD	25			39			25	38	33		6	20
ELL	28			51			36	47	70		6	43
AMI												
ASN	64			81			56	68	64		5	
BLK	37			56			26	68	73		5	
HSP	44			63			40	72	67		6	41

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
MUL	57			60			62	62	50		5	
PAC												
WHT	54			69			55	78	70		5	
FRL	35			53			36	62	52		6	35

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	53	47	33	63	67	55	56	78	69			41
SWD	27	37	30	32	50	38	33	46				
ELL	31	44	36	44	62	53	28	47				41
AMI												
ASN	67	66		77	72	42	55	69	77			
BLK	45	43	32	47	56	38	56	69	50			
HSP	51	47	37	58	69	65	51	73	75			43
MUL	57	46		67	73	55	62	92	71			
PAC												
WHT	55	47	28	67	68	54	59	82	68			
FRL	44	43	33	51	60	54	45	62	57			35

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	57	53	40	60	46	31	63	73	57			52
SWD	25	36	33	28	37	33	19	46				
ELL	36	48	45	45	37	18	50	73	69			52
AMI												
ASN	75	61		71	42		73	80	92			
BLK	44	44	24	39	36	31	44	51	28			
HSP	53	52	36	54	41	23	58	74	58			48
MUL	59	47		56	37		55	83				
PAC												
WHT	60	55	49	66	51	38	69	74	60			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
FRL	39	44	34	44	38	26	49	61	38			53

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	47%	48%	-1%	47%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	46%	2%	47%	1%
06	2023 - Spring	46%	46%	0%	47%	-1%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	54%	4%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	48%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	77%	67%	10%	55%	22%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	47%	46%	1%	44%	3%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	50%	48%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	70%	2%	66%	6%

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.

ELA - instruction was not to the rigor of the standard, and better monitoring for effective pedagogy needed to be implemented.

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

6th Grade ELA - instruction was not to the rigor of the standards and the 22-23 6th graders were in 3rd grade during COVID and were effected by the COVID slide.

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.

6th Grade ELA - instruction was not to the rigor of the standards and the 22-23 6th graders were in 3rd grade during COVID and were effected by the COVID slide.

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

7th Grade Math - the school demonstrated 49% proficiency and out-performed the state by 2%. A greater focus in collaboration and planning, coaching, and observation for best practices were cause for this result.

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

Clear expectations for planning by intentionally creating lesson plans, based on data-driven documentation in PLC's that are aligned to the standard(s).

Creating a system for monitor standards-aligned instruction.

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

Our school-wide area of focus is instructional practices relate to standards-aligned instruction.

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 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.

Area of Focus: Instructional practices relate to standards-aligned instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable Outcome: On the first attempt, 70% of students will score 70% or higher on CFA's.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring:

Admin

1. Master schedule ensures common planning.
2. Roles for Before, During, and After PLC documentation are defined.
3. Collaborate with Department Heads and Success Coaches prior to PLC.
4. Develop Tiered Level of Support Schedule for teachers.
5. Focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s)

Success Coaches

1. Focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s)
2. Identify and plan for the supports that the teachers will need before, during, and after planning
3. Collaborate with Department Heads and Administration prior to PLC.

Department Heads

1. Prepare for the planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance.
2. Collaborate with Success Coaches and Administration prior to PLC.
3. Focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tim Light (tlight@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.)

Evidence Based Strategies: Kagan Strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale:

1. There is no before, during, or after PLC documentation.
2. There is no evidence of a clear structure and protocol for planning focused on standard-aligned instruction because there is no defined structure for creating and submitting lesson plans, PLC documentation, and classroom board setup.
3. Assessment data from the 22-23 school year, except for 8th Grade Math, demonstrates a teacher gap in standard-aligned instruction:
 - a. 6th Grade ELA FAST PM
 - i. CCMS – 45% Proficient

- b. 7th Grade ELA FAST PM 3
 - i. CCMS 47% Proficient
- c. 8th Grade ELA FAST PM 3
 - i. CCMS – 48% Proficient
- d. 6th Grade Math FAST PM 3
 - i. CCMS – 58% Proficient
- e. 7th Grade Math FAST PM 3
 - i. CCMS – 49% Proficient
- f. 8th Grade FCAT
 - i. CCMS – 47% Proficient
- g. Civics
 - i. CCMS – 72% Profi

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 3 - Promising 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.

- Master schedule ensures common planning.
- Roles for Before, During, and After PLC documentation are defined.
- Collaborate with Department Heads and BSI Coaches prior to PLC.
- Develop Tiered Level of Support Schedule for teachers (see attached).
- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 3 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.

Person Responsible: Tim Light (tlight@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

- Master schedule ensures common planning.
- Roles for Before, During, and After PLC documentation are defined.
- Collaborate with Department Heads and BSI Coaches prior to PLC.
- Develop Tiered Level of Support Schedule for teachers (see attached).
- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 3 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.

Person Responsible: Meighan Melsheimer (mmelshei@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

- Master schedule ensures common planning.
- Roles for Before, During, and After PLC documentation are defined.
- Collaborate with Department Heads and BSI Coaches prior to PLC.
- Develop Tiered Level of Support Schedule for teachers (see attached).
- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 3 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.

Person Responsible: Kayla Nieves (knieves@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 3 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.
- Identify and plan for the supports that the teachers will need before, during, and after planning (pre-planning sessions, coaching questions to connect teacher thinking to aligned instruction, etc.)
- Collaborate with Department Heads and Administration prior to PLC.

Person Responsible: Joe Neale (jneale@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 3 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.
- Identify and plan for the supports that the teachers will need before, during, and after planning (pre-planning sessions, coaching questions to connect teacher thinking to aligned instruction, etc.)
- Collaborate with Department Heads and Administration prior to PLC.

Person Responsible: Kaitlyn Robin (krobin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 3 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.
- Identify and plan for the supports that the teachers will need before, during, and after planning (pre-planning sessions, coaching questions to connect teacher thinking to aligned instruction, etc.)
- Collaborate with Department Heads and Administration prior to PLC.

Person Responsible: Tori Scott (vmazzasc@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

- Prepare for the planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work.
- Collaborate with BSI Coaches and Administration prior to PLC.
- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 2 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.

Person Responsible: Thomas Carr (tmcarr@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

- Prepare for the planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work.
- Collaborate with BSI Coaches and Administration prior to PLC.
- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 2 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.

Person Responsible: Arielle Getz (agetz@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

- Prepare for the planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work.
- Collaborate with BSI Coaches and Administration prior to PLC.
- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 2 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.

Person Responsible: Justin Santiago (jisantia@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

- Prepare for the planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work.
- Collaborate with BSI Coaches and Administration prior to PLC.
- Based on the Tiered Level of Support Schedule (Tier 2 Teachers), focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.

Person Responsible: Michele McNaul (mmcnaul@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Until both instructional priorities are achieved.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Increase student engagement and student hope.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, as measured by the Gallup Student Survey, student Hope will be at a mean of 4.04 and Engagement at a mean of 3.54.

Monitoring:

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

Gallup Survey.

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.)

PBIS Rewards and Conscious Discipline.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Discipline data from the 22-23 school year indicates this need.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Develop Planning Week PD on Positive Behavior, Conscious Discipline, and School-Wide Discipline Plan
Utilize and Monitor teacher use of PBIS Rewards App in the awarding of "Coyote Cash" to students who demonstrate HOWL misison

Develop physical school store for students to use their "Coyote Cash" to purchase items

Show and encourage teachers to create and use their own classroom stores as a means to motivate positive behavior.

Focus and train staff on brain states during Early Release PD

Daily, remind students of the HOWL expectations

Post HOWL expectations in classrooms, hallways, offices, cafeteria, gym, restrooms, and media center

Person Responsible: Meighan Melsheimer (mmelshei@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2024

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.