

Pasco County Schools

West Pasco Education Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

West Pasco Education Academy

7229 HUDSON AVE, Hudson, FL 34667

<https://wpea.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.

WPEA will promote a growth mindset and a school culture that embraces challenges as opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

WPEA will foster a community where students understand the value of a high school diploma and the limitless opportunities it may provide for their future.

Purpose:

WPEA will create a common language of hope and inspiration in our school community where students are not defined by their past behaviors.

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
DeWalt, Travis	Principal	
Longstreet, Lashaquonta	Teacher, K-12	
Wachtel, Brian	Behavior Specialist	
Watson, Jackie	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

WPEA's SLT analyzes data to determine appropriate goals for the upcoming school year. The SLT is also responsible for monitoring data points every 5 weeks to ensure interventions are effective; if not, suggestions for modifications are provided. Parents, students and community leaders are provided the opportunity to review data and provide input for processing.

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))

WPEA utilizes a school-wide system to monitor off-track students. In addition to monitoring academic data every 5 weeks, the SLT will review live-time data as related to off-track students and the interventions that have been implemented. The utilization of multiple data points allows the SLT to monitor intervention effectiveness and modify 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)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	41%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: I 2018-19: I 2017-18: I 2016-17: I
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	42	33	56	131	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	37	63	149	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	23	43	96	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	22	41	84	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	24	50	108	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	23	45	101	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	40	71	158

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	12	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7

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	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	27	69	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	16	60	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	109	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	8	26	60	231

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	27	27
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	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	27	45	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	16	31	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	8	26	60	94

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	27	27
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*	3	49	50	6	51	51	0		
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	5	40	38	2	35	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		66	64	5	50	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		67	66	0	49	48			
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	0	91	89	0	63	61			
College and Career Acceleration		67	65		68	67			
ELP Progress		46	45						

** 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	3
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	8
Total Components for the Federal Index	3

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	51
Graduation Rate	0

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	3
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	13
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	35
Graduation Rate	0

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	6	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	7	Yes	3	3
FRL	9	Yes	3	3

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	7	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	27	Yes	2	2
FRL	13	Yes	2	2

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	3			5						0		
SWD	6			5							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	8			6							2	
FRL	13			13							3	

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	6			2			5	0		0		
SWD	7											
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	27											
FRL	25									0		

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	0											
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	0											

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
10	2023 - Spring	11%	51%	-40%	50%	-39%
07	2023 - Spring	7%	48%	-41%	47%	-40%
08	2023 - Spring	0%	46%	-46%	47%	-47%
09	2023 - Spring	19%	48%	-29%	48%	-29%
06	2023 - Spring	0%	46%	-46%	47%	-47%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	0%	54%	-54%	54%	-54%
07	2023 - Spring	6%	48%	-42%	48%	-42%
08	2023 - Spring	26%	67%	-41%	55%	-29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	13%	46%	-33%	44%	-31%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	13%	50%	-37%	50%	-37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	49%	-27%	48%	-26%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	29%	65%	-36%	63%	-34%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	70%	-52%	66%	-48%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	25%	65%	-40%	63%	-38%

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.

According to EWS, students with one or more suspensions totaled 149 students. The West Pasco Education Academy is an alternative setting. That said, students are disciplinary reassigned to our setting when they accrue enough referrals warranting a disciplinary reassignment hearing. WPEA experienced a 40% staff turnover last year. In addition, many new systems and structures were implemented.

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

The number of students failing their math course showed the greatest decline in performance year over year. In 2022 there were 31 students who failed their math course, and in 2023 that number was 84. This decline in performance could be attributed to procedural changes that were implemented related to how student grades are calculated and reported in regards to transfers within 10 days of the marking period. If a student transferred to WPEA within 10 days of the marking period, their course grade would be posted by the sending school. This is in contrast to years prior where WPEA teachers were attempting to assess mastery of standards and calculate course grades in 10 school days or less.

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.

SWD students that received one or more suspensions is the data component with the largest gap when compared to the state average. WPEA is an alternative setting comprised of a student population that were disciplinarily reassigned to WPEA for behavioral issues (75% WPEA- 39% State Avg.).

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

The number of students retained: current year showed the greatest decline. 2022 had 27 students retained compared to only 12 in 2023. A contributing variable resulting in the decline was the implementation of a school wide monitoring system to identify off-track students. The system required

the identification of barriers, implementation of interventions and daily/ weekly monitoring. All stakeholders had access to the monitoring tool, regularly analyzed data points, and used current data points to guide instructional decisions.

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

Attendance and Suspensions are two potential areas of concern as 65% of the students had missed 10% or more days of school and 75% of our students had one or more disciplinary referrals.

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

Level I ELA and Math statewide assessments

Attendance

Behavior/ Suspension

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance**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.

The intensive student behaviors that exist in our setting create a mental health barrier for our staff. As a result, a third of our staff missed more than ten days of school this past year. When we discussed attendance (individually) with the staff, a majority cited a mental health component and the need for a reset. That said, we added a mental health component to our summer retreat. We will expand upon this work by infusing it in our PLCs and Early Release Day professional development. The staff's well-being is critical for our school's success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school expects to see a 20% decrease in staff absenteeism.

Monitoring:

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

Staff attendance will be analyzed quarterly. We have shared the alarming overall absenteeism percentage with the staff. That said, we plan to share the quarterly percentage with the staff to reinforce transparency and our team approach to addressing the issue.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Travis DeWalt (tdewalt@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.)

The school will implement and monitor mindfulness strategies throughout the school year. We will infuse practice and discussions within our PLC and ERD structures. The effectiveness will be monitored through staff attendance. In other words, the staff's engagement in the mindfulness strategies should minimize their need for frequent absences due to cited mental health and or simply needing a reset.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intensive student behaviors that exist in our setting create a mental health barrier for our staff. As a result, a third of our staff missed more than ten days this past school year. When we discussed attendance (individually) with the staff, a majority cited a mental health component and the need for a reset. That said, we added a mental health component to our summer retreat. We will expand upon this work by infusing it in our PLCs and Early Release Day professional development. The staff's well-being is critical for our school's success.

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.

Identified mindfulness strategies will be infused within the PLC structure. As a result the PLC will engage in learning new strategies, practicing new strategies and collaborate as to effectiveness. The aforementioned will be captured and monitored in our PLC framework. Similarly, the staff (school-wide) will engage in new learning surrounding self help (mindfulness strategies) during our Early Release Days.

Person Responsible: Shawn Holyoke (sholyoke@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: The PLC framework will be monitored monthly to ensure strategies are being discussed and implemented. Our ERD professional development calendar for the year has been created to ensure the staff has access to new self help (mindfulness strategies) learning opportunities.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Although an alternative setting, emphasis has to be placed upon academics as well as behavior. That said,

WPEA will develop structure and systems through the 3 School Teams to support success for all subgroups of students including the lowest performing subgroups: W, SWD, and FRL..

Measurable Outcome:

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

The implementation of a school wide monitoring tool will provide data to ensure appropriate timely tiers of support are afforded to our students. As a result, we anticipate our on-track percentage to increase by 20%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration, Student Services Team, and PLCs will look at data weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Travis DeWalt (tdewalt@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.)

The tool will ensure that preventative problem solving will occur. In other words, when students are off-track behaviorally or academically, the staff is tasked with identifying the barrier. Once the barrier is identified, collectively they implement an intervention to help the student. The tool also captures the student's goals enabling all stakeholders to engage in a common language.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Prior to the implementation of the school-wide monitoring tool, teachers were unaware if their students were on or off track. The tool not only identifies the students' on/ off track status, but also contains barriers, interventions and monitoring opportunities. This enables ineffective interventions to be modified to better meet the needs of students before it is too late.

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.

Administration will construct the monitoring tool and will teach the PLC and SST leaders how to use and monitor the tool.

Person Responsible: Travis DeWalt (tdewalt@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: The monitoring tool will be ready for usage on or before the first day of school. The expectation is for all teams to use the team weekly so that data is continually driving next steps.

#3. 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.

Through classroom observations, it was evident that teacher's were not intentionally planning their units of instruction. When asked about lesson planning, all of them stated that they did not lesson plan in an alternative setting.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of our work, we anticipate our on-track student academic percentage to increase by 20%.

Monitoring:

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

This focus will be monitored by weekly classroom observations. In addition to observations, the administration will review the school-wide monitoring tool every five weeks to ensure the student academic on-track percentage is steadily increasing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Travis DeWalt (tdewalt@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.)

The teachers will engage in lesson planning to include clear learning goals (aligned to appropriate benchmark), daily learning targets, and tasks that demonstrate evidence of the daily learning target.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Classroom observations yielded concerns regarding planning as students were unable to share what they learned and struggled to share the purpose of the lesson.

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

#4. -- 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.