

Pasco County Schools

East 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

East Pasco Education Academy

35830 STATE ROAD 52, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://epea.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.

The EPEA family's mission is to motivate our students to discover their small successes every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our family at EPEA values, respects, and responds to students' individual needs with the purpose of developing positive character traits. Our quality and dedicated staff provide a positive, supportive, safe, and nurturing environment to instill responsibility and respect for self and others. Our students will learn problem solving and conflict resolutions skills while exploring career choices to become effective contributors to the 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
Carrino, Shelley	Principal	Oversees the operation of East Pasco, JDC, and SDC. Provides a safe learning environment.
Mitch, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Oversees the operation of East Pasco, JDC, and SDC. Provides a safe learning environment.
Brophy, Natalia	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Ms. Brophy will work with students on identifying their post-secondary options and setting goals.
Mink, Jill	Teacher, K-12	Dr. Mink provides reading interventions to students.
Rudolph, Jane	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Rudolph works with students on recovering their credits and previously failed courses.
Salyer, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	Provides coaching and support for students who are off-track academically.
Harris, Sherri	School Counselor	Ms. Harris works with students on reviewing their academics and social needs. She provides support for these students in all areas.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The school leadership team was heavily involved with the development of the SuP after a review of data for the year (academic, attendance, and discipline). Additionally, the information was shared with the whole staff during a meeting. In February, the School Advisory Council was presented information regarding the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the data that was used to determine goals. The School Advisory Council consists of business and community leaders local to our area, as well as school and district employees. It is difficult to include students due to bussing as they are not able to participate in morning meetings. Additionally, students are not with us long-term. The student Gallup survey results were reviewed and used for goal development.

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 SuP will be reviewed monthly with the school leadership team. Quarterly data (academics, attendance, and discipline) will be reviewed with the leadership team and whole staff during regular meetings. The School Advisory Council will also review this quarterly data. If at any time, it is determined that there needs to be a revision to the SuP, the data and goals will be reviewed by the school leadership team and whole staff.

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	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
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)* 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: MAINTAINING
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	17	15	71	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	63	95
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	70	94
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	53	76

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	17	18	78	113

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	17	15	71	159
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	63	144
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	8	16	70	173
L1 on Statewide Assessments ELA OR MATH	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	53	128

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	17	18	78	189

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	17	15	71	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	63	95
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	8	16	70	94
L1 on Statewide Assessments ELA OR MATH	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	53	76

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	17	18	78	113

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	4	49	50	6	51	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	4	40	38	3	35	38	11		
Math Learning Gains							25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		66	64	0	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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	8
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	0

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	2
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	9
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	47
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
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				
FRL	0	Yes	4	4

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	8	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	0	Yes	3	3
FRL	7	Yes	3	3

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	4			4						0		
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												

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												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL											1	

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			3			0	0		0		
SWD				8								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										0		
FRL	17			5						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				11	25							
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												

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				14								

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	9%	51%	-42%	50%	-41%
07	2023 - Spring	0%	48%	-48%	47%	-47%
08	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	9%	48%	-39%	48%	-39%
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	0%	48%	-48%	48%	-48%
08	2023 - Spring	5%	67%	-62%	55%	-50%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	0%	46%	-46%	44%	-44%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	2%	50%	-48%	50%	-48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	10%	49%	-39%	48%	-38%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	7%	65%	-58%	63%	-56%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	8%	70%	-62%	66%	-58%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	20%	65%	-45%	63%	-43%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our data is very different due to the transient nature of our students, so there are not subgroups that can be accurately compared to the state average. However, we notice that our SWD often struggle with meeting standards. Due to us being a behavior focused school, the students' behavior at their previous schools has created a barrier for them to get consistent support from their zoned schools. These students are with us for a short period of time and tend to show more success here due to the structures that we are able to implement, such as smaller class sizes, ESE certified teachers in every classroom, block scheduling with two teachers in the classroom for core classes, and multiple IAs pushing into the classroom for additional academic assistance.

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

Our data is very different due to the transient nature of our students, so there are not subgroups that can be accurately compared to the state average.

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

Our data is very different due to the transient nature of our students, so there are not subgroups that can be accurately compared to the state average.

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

Our data is very different due to the transient nature of our students, so we do not have enough data to determine a most improved area.

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

Students with 2 or more indicators and students with 10% attendance were our two areas of concerns.

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

Attendance

Increase student engagement

Students working on problem solving skills

Reduction in discipline referrals (disruptive behavior, verbal altercation, and defiance/disrespect)

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 Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

School staff will collaborate with all stakeholders to increase Student Hope. EPEA will improve our culture of teamwork and belongingness.

Measurable Outcome:

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

This will be measured by at least .3 increase on the Student Gallup survey.

This will be measured by .65 increase as measured by Q10 on the Gallup survey.

Monitoring:

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

Student Hope will be monitored through the use of Triangle of Supports with a student being assigned a mentor of their choosing to check in weekly. Additionally, students participate in Mindful Mondays with their teachers to work on mindset. Students will complete Naviance to determine post-secondary options that are available for them through career exploration. This information will be discussed weekly during PLCs as well.

The culture of our staff will be monitored through mentor/mentee relationships. Additionally, the school leadership team will conduct pulse checks on a monthly basis. Feedback from staff regarding meetings and opportunities to provide meaningful topics for the agenda.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shelley Carrino (scarrino@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.)

Seven Mindsets is used with all students in the school for Mindful Mondays, which focuses on growth mindset, problem solving, etc. Naviance is an application that helps students determine post-secondary goals and needs. EverFi will also be used with middle school students which also helps them navigate problem solving and other post-secondary goals.

Use a system of positive behavior supports, including point cards with students and families to increase on task behavior, self-regulation, and social emotional learning between school and families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Seven Mindsets is being used every Monday with students to help students find appropriate ways to handle problems and work on a growth mindset, which can help improve hope.

Naviance allows students to identify their interests and skills which then links to potential post-secondary options to help them with goal-setting.

EverFi is an application that provides a variety of course options for students ranging from problem solving, conflict resolution to post-secondary exploration.

It is important that we strengthen and support the social, emotional, and mental health needs of our students.

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.

Utilize small groups, counseling services, and our Triangle of Supports to support the social, emotional, and mental health needs of our students.

Administrators will have interactive and engaging meetings for our staff members.

Teachers will have opportunities to develop agenda topics for meetings.

Continue the use of Naviance for post-secondary planning.

Staff will receive PBIS PD.

Person Responsible: Jessica Mitch (jeawilli@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly throughout the semester (many students transition at the semester so we will review at that time)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

By the end of each quarter, attendance will increase which will improve the number of academically on track students (defined as having C's or higher).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Every quarter we will see an increase of 10% compared to last year.

The number of students who are on track (defined as having C's or higher) will increase up to 70% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance is reviewed monthly at our Student Services meetings. It is also discussed by teachers at PLCs weekly. School leadership team reviews data monthly including attendance and academics. Students who drop below C's are tracked daily through a spreadsheet as it is tied to their point card and this is monitored by teachers.

Teachers will intentionally plan and implement differentiated learning experiences aligned to the rigor of the standards. (Small Group mini lessons, project-based learning, & conferencing with students)

Weekly PLC discussions focusing on Tiered supports for students using our MTSS Pyramid

Teachers will deliver Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports for essential standards daily in class by implementing intentional grouping and discussion protocols between students.

Utilize Tiger Time to provide career-focused exploration, enrichment activities in Reading, Life-Skills, and Community Based engagement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Mitch (jeawilli@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.)

Teachers will intentionally plan and implement differentiated learning experiences aligned to the rigor of the standards. (Small Group mini lessons, project-based learning, & conferencing with students)

Weekly PLC discussions focusing on Tiered supports for students using our MTSS Pyramid

Teachers will deliver Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports for essential standards daily in class by implementing intentional grouping and discussion protocols between students.

Kagan Cooperative Learning structures will be used. Some staff members attended the 5-day training over the summer and will be providing PD for the staff.

Accountable Talk will be another strategy that staff will incorporate into their daily lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Meeting students where they are at is the first step in creating a positive classroom environment where all student's needs are met. To meet student needs our teachers need to be able to differentiate and provide the appropriate Tired interventions to help all their students reach their potential.

Kagan Cooperative Learning allows students to feel more connected and engaged with the content they are learning. Accountable Talk provides students with the opportunity to agree to disagree in a respectable manner and to have all opinions considered.

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.

Teachers will engage in quarterly walkthroughs and reflective practices utilizing the IPG (Instructional Practice Guide) to monitor rigor.

Triangle of Support where students work with mentors to set goals to improve attendance, academics, and behavior.

Teachers will anticipate student needs and design differentiated learning experiences and Tier 2 interventions aligned to the rigor of the standards.

Teachers will implement Tier I & Tier II instruction utilizing collaborative teaching structures.

Staff will be provided with Kagan Cooperative Learning PD.

Person Responsible: Jessica Mitch (jeawilli@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Continuously weekly

#3. 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.

Working with students on problem-solving skills through small group and mentor relationships.

Measurable Outcome:

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

EPEA will see a reduction in discipline referrals coded 2B, 2G, & 2R by 25% as compared to the previous year.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline referral data will be reviewed monthly during PBIS, SLT, PLCs, and Student Services meetings. Point cards will also be reviewed during PBIS, SLT, and Student Services meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Mitch (jeawilli@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.)

Utilize our Mindset Mondays with the Seven Mindsets curriculum to work on problem solving and growth mindset. Additionally, use a system of positive behavior supports, including point cards with students to increase on task behavior and self-regulation. Groups will be uniquely developed for our most at-risk students exhibiting disruptive behavior. Peer mediation will be offered for students who are struggling to get along as a potential intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Mindset Mondays will help students navigate through their growth mindset and problem solving through situations. Through the system of positive behavior supports, including point cards, students are held accountable and are able to self-regulate their academics and behavior. Groups will help students work through a variety of situations with a problem-solving, conflict resolution focus. When used peer mediation can help students work on conflict resolution and learn how to get along better.

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.

Discipline IA's, Counselors, Behavior Specialists, and Social Worker will push into the classroom or pull out into small groups to work with students.

Discipline IA's will work with students on reflecting on their discipline referrals to create a plan to improve behaviors.

Person Responsible: Sherri Harris (ssharris@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Continuously on a weekly basis

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 FloridaBEST 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.

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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)

N/A

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))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A