

Pasco County Schools

Chester W. Taylor, Jr. Elementary 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Chester W. Taylor, Jr. Elementary School

3638 MORRIS BRIDGE RD, Zephyrhills, FL 33543

<https://cwtes.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.

CWTES is committed to a student-centered environment with expectations of high quality instruction demonstrated through professionalism and integrity to create life-long learners as a collaborative community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

CWTES is committed to a student-centered environment with expectations of high quality instruction demonstrated through professionalism and integrity to create life-long learners as a collaborative community.

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
Marks, Julie	Principal	
Dameron, Juana	Assistant Principal	
McDermott, Kathleen	Instructional Coach	
Jenkins, Amanda	Instructional Coach	
Garrison, Carmen	Teacher, ESE	
Steinhoff, Maria	Teacher, K-12	
Flanary, Eileen	Teacher, K-12	
Rice, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	
Braun, Kelsy	Teacher, K-12	
Polacco, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	
Joyce, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Caparaso, Bethany	Other	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

At CWTES we involve our staff and parents through a survey to collect data on their needs. The SAC, which includes community members, assists us in creating the survey for the parents and then we send the survey out to parents via email and newsletter. The SAC and leadership team then reviews the results and assists us in our creation of the SIP.

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))

The SIP and data is reviewed monthly with our SIT team as well as in individual PLC meetings.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	40	32	30	26	31	26	0	0	0	185	
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	12	
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	42	34	34	0	0	0	110	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	37	43	0	0	0	113	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	13	25	36	30	39	0	0	0	146	
Course Failure Math/ELA Combined	2	1	3	4	2	3	0	0	0	15	

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	43	32	38	40	56	55	0	0	0	264

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	2	7	27	15	22	13	0	0	0	86	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	6	
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	3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
Course Failure in ELA or math	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	5	
Lvl 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	7	10	4	0	0	0	21	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	13	4	6	1	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	5	12	7	0	0	0	0	29
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	2	7	27	15	22	13	0	0	0	86	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	6	
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	3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
Course Failure in ELA or math	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	5	
Lvl 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	7	10	4	0	0	0	21	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	13	4	6	1	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	5	12	7	0	0	0	0	29
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*	34	47	53	40	52	56	36		
ELA Learning Gains				47			27		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			38		
Math Achievement*	40	48	59	38	46	50	32		
Math Learning Gains				48			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			33		
Science Achievement*	38	50	54	32	50	59	25		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	41	61	59	76			58		

** 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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	186
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	375
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	16	Yes	2	2
ELL	35	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	32	Yes	1	
MUL	37	Yes	3	
PAC				
WHT	39	Yes	1	
FRL	33	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	47			
MUL	33	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	47			

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	34			40			38					41
SWD	14			19			7				4	
ELL	26			37							3	41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			45							2	
HSP	28			37			21				5	44
MUL	33			40							2	
PAC												
WHT	36			40			44				4	
FRL	29			37			36				5	39

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	40	47	53	38	48	41	32					76
SWD	16	43	55	25	32	9	25					
ELL	32	43		25	47		18					76
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	38	60	60	33	39		23					73
MUL	28	30		33	40							
PAC												
WHT	42	47	55	40	51	43	38					
FRL	38	46	53	36	46	42	32					80

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	36	27	38	32	34	33	25					58
SWD	18	24	40	26	30		13					
ELL	30			20								58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	31	27		26	29		11					59
MUL	29			12								
PAC												
WHT	38	25	29	36	38	38	33					
FRL	34	26	39	32	32	30	23					56

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	51%	-22%	54%	-25%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	48%	-17%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	47%	50%	-3%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	54%	-8%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	23%	52%	-29%	55%	-32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	49%	-13%	51%	-15%

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.

5th grade math and ELA

3rd grade reading

In 5th grade we had one teacher responsible for all of the math instruction. There was lack of consistency in classroom management in all 5th grade classrooms. We also only had 27% of our 5th grade students on track for attendance.

In 3rd grade, we had 2 new teachers to our school and one was new to teaching.

Across the school we gained many new students throughout the year.

We are also hypothesizing that students were not being asked enough high level questions and being asked to grapple with the text on their own.

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

Our overall ELA achievement went down by 5%. We are especially concerned with grade 3 and 5.

There was lack of consistency in classroom management in all 5th grade classrooms. We also only had 27% of our 5th grade students on track for attendance.

In 3rd grade, we had 2 new teachers to our school and one was new to teaching.

Across the school we gained many new students throughout the year.

We are also hypothesizing that students were not being asked enough high level questions and being asked to grapple with the text on their own.

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.

5th grade math

In 5th grade we had one teacher responsible for all of the math instruction. There was lack of consistency in classroom management in all 5th grade classrooms. We also only had 27% of our 5th grade students on track for attendance. We used the 50/50 instructional model all year and we are not sure that students were getting enough grade level practice.

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

We saw minimal improvement in science and math, but only by 2-3% each.

We did early release day PD specific to content levels. In science, we used the end of module data to go back and reteach. We also used rigby readers that aligned to science in tier II reading.

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

An area that we continue to be concerned with the most is our attendance as well as our early check outs and tardies. We have a fulltime teaching staff that plan together, our coaches are knowledgeable and provide support where needed and we have systems in place for students to be successful. When only 26% of our students are coming to school regularly, it is tough to fill in the gaps. We also are a growing community with many families moving in throughout the year, some students with significant needs and well below grade level. We are doing our best to keep up with our growth.

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

3rd and 5th grade ELA

Attendance

5th grade Math

K-2 foundational skills

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 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.

CWTES will continue our attendance and behavior incentive plans to improve our overall average daily attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our average daily attendance will increase to 92%. We will increase the number of students on target for behavior by 5% and decrease the numbers of students at risk and off track by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

We monitor attendance monthly by school and grade level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Caparaso (bcaparas@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.)

Students that were at-risk or off-track for attendance for the 2022-2023 school year will receive a letter within the first month of the school year to inform parents that there will be a monitoring plan in place for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monthly attendance incentives will continue to celebrate students for good attendance.

Students that are at-risk or off track will receive monthly attendance letters and be put on an attendance monitoring plan with the social worker.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students are not in school, they can not learn.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

3rd grade and 5th grade reading data was well below the state and district average in 2022-2023 school year according to FAST

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the conclusion of the 2023-2024 school year, there will be an increase of 10% across all grade levels in proficiency as measured by the FAST assessments from the 2022-2023 school year.

We will see at least 60% of our students make a learning gain from 2022-2023 school year to the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Action plans are developed and monitored every 6 weeks in ELA. These action plans are focused on our tier II students, however, all students needing support within guided reading groups are addressed as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Marks (jmarks@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.)

Rigby Readers are used for guided reading groups as well as Tier II groups. Tier II groups focus on fluency, vocabulary development and comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We need to see our students reading at grade level.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Early Literacy with a focus on foundational skills

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 2023-2024 school year, we will have 65% of our students scoring core and above on Dibels.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor using dibels, 3 times a year as well as every 6 weeks through action plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Marks (jmarks@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 will be using UFLI across kindergarten through 2nd grade as a tier I resource and will use it as a tier II resource too.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is an evidence based program that is systematic and explicit.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Teachers and staff will continue to deepen their knowledge of the New Florida BEST Standards in Math and continue to build their understanding of the Big M.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the conclusion of the 2023-2024 school year, there will be an increase of 10% across all grade levels in proficiency as measured by the FAST assessments from the 2022-2023 school year

Monitoring:

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

Students will take end of module assessments where action plans and data analysis will occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Jenkins (aplaiste@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 new Eureka math program will be implemented with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Only 40% of our students were proficient in math last year as a whole.

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

#5. 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.

Teachers and staff will continue to build a strong system that supports all academic needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD will increase by 12%

ELL will increase by 5%

Multiracial will increase by 10%

Monitoring:

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

PLCs along with intervention teachers, coaches, and administrators will use the data from diagnostic tools as well as formative and summative assessments throughout the year to inform tiered instruction with all students, especially those in specific subgroups.

Screening data will be used to identify students for tier III and diagnostic data will be used to target intervention needs for students.

DIBELS will be used in grades K-5 to identify tier I trends and gaps in all areas of reading using the teaching assessing cycle.

PLC's will use EOY data to form BOY intervention groups for the next grade

During PLC's teachers will utilize the MTSS Reading Decision Making Tree as well as the ELN resources to create Tier II groups based on the targeted need.

Instructional Assistants will be trained in using research-based materials to deliver Tier II interventions based on the MTSS Reading Decision Making Tree. This will be based on the student's individual targeted needs.

During PLCs, teachers will use assessment protocols to drive instruction in ELA and math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Marks (jmarks@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.)

UFLI will be used in grades K-2

Rigby readers will be used in grades 3-5

Academic tutor will be used in grades 3-5 to support students in math using end of module assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have 3 subgroups that need improvement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Explicit instruction in phonics in grades K-2

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

Explicit instruction in comprehension and vocabulary in grades 3-5

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

65% of students in grades K-2 will score core or core and above according to DIBELS.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

50% of students in grades 3-5 will score proficient according to the end of year FAST in reading.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

After each module assessment, teachers complete an assessment protocol and regroup students needing support if needed. If there are trends in classrooms where we identify a tier I issue, then we plan for tier I specifically related to that

deficit. Lesson plans are also monitored for high quality questioning, Kagan structures, and learning targets aligned to BEST standards.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Marks, Julie, jmarks@pasco.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

UFLI will be implemented as the core resources for phonics instruction in grades K-2. It will also be used as tier II in grades K- 2. We will continue to use SIPPS for tier III.

Guided reading groups will be implemented daily for all students and students needing tier II supports will focus on building fluency and comprehension. Those students needing tier III will get UFLI or SIPPS depending on needs.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Using UFLI in K-2 has strong evidence supporting phonics explicit instruction and data from other counties that supports the growth in early literacy.

We also use HMH as our core resource in grades 3-5 along with SIPPS for those that are struggling.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Implement UFLI in grades K-2 · Initial UFLI implementation training for K-2 teachers. · Follow-Up UFLI training to review best practices of instruction · Monitoring of instruction as needed	Marks, Julie, jmarks@pasco.k12.fl.us
Focus on Comprehension and Vocabulary Development in grades 3-5	Marks, Julie, jmarks@pasco.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership/Coaching ELA ITC regularly plans with teachers to support rigorous instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards. Participates in literacy walk-throughs to identify schoolwide trends. Identifies, supports, and monitors Tier II teachers with planning and instruction	Marks, Julie, jmarks@pasco.k12.fl.us
Assessment	
Utilize UFLI weekly assessments to monitor new concept words, irregular words and dictation.	
Utilize DIBELS, three times per year, to monitor and identify students at or above core, strategic learners and students who are at risk in literacy skills.	Marks, Julie, jmarks@pasco.k12.fl.us
Utilize Renaissance for K-2 students to assess early reading skills three times per year.	
Utilize FAST for 3-5 students to assess reading comprehension skills three times per year.	
Professional Learning	
ELA teachers attend monthly Early Release Trainings focused on best practices in literacy.	Marks, Julie, jmarks@pasco.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We have a parent friendly version of our SIP plan that is located on our website. This plan is initiated in the spring each year through data collection of academics, behavior, and attendance. We involve parents by sending out a survey created by our SAC council. We then collect the results of the survey and review with our SAC council as well. Once we finalize the SIP, we share with the SAC(all are invited). We also share it with our parents at our annual title one Open House in the fall. The website where the SIP is housed is <https://cwtes.pasco.k12.fl.us/>.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We have a parent friendly version of our parent involvement plan that is located on our website. This plan is initiated in the spring each year through data collection of academics, behavior, and attendance. We involve parents by sending out a survey created by our SAC council. We then collect the results of the survey and review with our SAC council as well. Once we finalize the plan, we share with the SAC(all are invited). We also share it with our parents at our annual title one Open House in the fall and send a version home on Meet the Teacher Day. We also have a parent portal that houses all important information for parents to view their child's progress as well as a weekly newsletter with links for parents and the teachers send out a meet the teacher page with all their contact information. The website where the plan is housed is <https://cwtes.pasco.k12.fl.us/>.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

This year we have implemented an advanced math class that starts in 3rd grade. We also have created cohorts of our gifted students to better meet their needs. We offer extended school year and extended school day to our students as well.

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

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