Pinewood Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pinewood Elementary School

5200 SE WILLOUGHBY BLVD, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/pes

Demographics

Principal: Susanna Deutsch

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (39%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Pinewood Elementary School

5200 SE WILLOUGHBY BLVD, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/pes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Pinewood Elementary School is to Educate All Students for Success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Pinewood Elementary School is to build a Dynamic Educational System of Success.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Deutsch, Susanna	Principal	Plan, implement and oversee instructional curriculum, staff observations and feedback, academic and operational resources, SIP, SAC, PBIS, State Assessments, and overall operations of the physical building and overall school budget.
Morrell, Aimee	Assistant Principal	
Morris, Patty	Assistant Principal	
Mannion, Maureen	Reading Coach	Coaching for teachers in Literacy, SAC Chairperson
Martin, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Interventions for students in Reading
Laing, Gordon	Instructional Coach	Interventions for students in mathematics
Catapano, Adele	Instructional Coach	Interventions for students in reading

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/17/2022, Susanna Deutsch

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

736

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	142	120	134	133	128	161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	818
Attendance below 90 percent	56	48	42	42	51	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287
One or more suspensions	4	0	1	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	56	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	41	55	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	1	36	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
	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	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	1	36	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/17/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	124	132	129	130	160	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	802
Attendance below 90 percent	35	42	26	38	39	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	44	43	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	60	57	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	49	47	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	124	132	129	130	160	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	802
Attendance below 90 percent	35	42	26	38	39	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	44	43	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	60	57	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	49	47	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	53%	56%				48%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						60%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						63%	56%	53%
Math Achievement	42%	43%	50%				61%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	46%						73%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						59%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	54%	59%				48%	58%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	32%	58%	-26%	62%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	67%	6%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	64%	4%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	22	42	45	25	53	37	22				
ELL	23	33	26	24	38	29	16				
ASN	86			100							
BLK	21	31		28	43		18				
HSP	28	40	32	28	41	33	26				
MUL	32	38		53	71						
WHT	55	49		58	45		51				
FRL	33	41	33	33	43	32	32				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	21	25		17	13		23				
ELL	23	45	67	27	32	33	15				
ASN	73			100							
BLK	37	31		20	25		33				
HSP	27	47	64	27	27	30	15				
MUL	25			26							
WHT	58	48		51	37		64				
FRL	32	45	68	28	26	33	17				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	49	47	37	58	53	25				
ELL	26	52	64	42	69	62	18				
ASN	58	60		83	80						
BLK	44	65		47	76						
HSP	38	58	60	48	71	60	36				
MUL	50	80		58	73						
WHT	58	59	58	75	73	59	58				
FRL	35	56	65	48	70	58	38				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In ELA, Grades 3 and 5 showed a 4 and 10 percentage point increase, respectively, in overall achievement. Grade 4 demonstrated a 10 percentage point decrease over last year. In Math, grades 3 and 5 demonstrated a 15 and 12 percentage point increase. Grade 4 showed an 8 percentage point decrease in overall achievement.
In ELA, the subgroups of hispanic and ESE students increased 1 percentage point, while white and black subgroups dropped 3 and 16 percentage points, respectively. The ELL subgroup remained the same. In Math, white, black, hispanic and ESE subgroups improved by 7, 8 1 and 8 percentage points respectively with ELL dropping by 3. In Science, we improved by 6 percentage points overall. The Hispanic and ELL subgroups improved by 11 and 1 percentage point respectively. Black and ESE students declined by 15 and 1 percentage points.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA, Math and Science all demonstrate a need in overall proficiency and for each of our subgroups

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

A change in the delivery of instruction and a focus on the level of rigorous instruction is necessary to improve achievement in all content areas and for all subgroups of students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math showed the greatest improvement with a 6 percentage point increase followed by 5th grade Science with a 6 point increase

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Interventionists were used to provide layered academic interventions in grade 3-5 for both ELA and Math. The Science lab teacher was removed from the related arts wheel for 2 grade levels in order to push into the 5th grade classrooms to provide additional Science support.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Teachers and staff will be receiving targeted PD to increase the level of student centered instructional strategies. Student Teaming will be implemented in all content areas with weekly instructional coaching and leadership coaching to accelerate learning. ELL paras will be provided specific plans for students needing language supports.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Learning Sciences International will be providing professional development to the teachers and staff. Once per week instructional coaching and leadership coaching will be provided by their staff to support the learning. The Title I department will be providing monthly professional development for all ELL paras to aid in providing supports to students acquiring the language. PLC's will be focusing on backwards planning.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Administrative walk throughs and continuous feedback will be provided to all teachers. This data will be collected and utilized to craft professional development needed for this year and beyond. Master Schedule providing common planning time, scheduled weekly PLC time.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	39% of students in grades 3-5 scored levels 3 and above on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA, the remaining 61% of students scored a level 1 or 2. 35% of our students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 demonstrated a learning gain on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) 22% of our students in the ESE subgroup and 23% of our students in the ELL subgroup in grades 3-5 scored levels 3 and above on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA)
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 39% to 44% on the 2022-2023 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3 in ELA, thereby reducing the percentage of students scoring levels 1 or 2 to 50% or below. The percentage of students in the lowest quartile demonstrating a learning gain in grades 3-5 will increase from 35% to 41% on the 2022-2022 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3. The percentage of students in the ESE and ELL subgroups in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 22% to 32% and 23% to 33% respectively on the 2022-2023 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM 3.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The 2022-2023 administration of the grade 3-5 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM 1-3 ELA is how we will determine if we have met the minimum desired outcome. Throughout the year we will be reviewing data from these assessments in addition to Benchmark Advance unit and weekly assessments, MTSS progress monitoring, and additional layered intervention data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susanna Deutsch (deutscs@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Professional development in research based instructional practices that impact student engagement, learning, and achievement. 2. PLC focused on backward planning to ensure lessons, activities, and assessments are aligned to BEST standards.

3. Professional development in understanding BEST Standards, including what is expected of the teacher and learner and how to supplement the current curriculum to meet the BEST standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Student overall performance data on standardized assessment indicates there is a need for improvement in tier 1 practices including planning (the alignment of BEST Standards with the curriculum being used) and monitoring of student progress toward meeting Standards.

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.

District instructional coach will provide modeling, coaching cycles, one on one planning sessions, and support grade level PLC planning to develop teachers understanding and implementation of standards, formative and summative assessments, and instructional practices.

Person Responsible	Maureen Mannion (manniom@martin.k12.fl.us)

District instructional coach will support teachers accessing, understanding/analyzing WIDA Access Data and implementation of Benchmark Advanced ELL Support to intentionally plan for ELL student instruction at their zone of proximal development.

Person Responsible	Maureen Mannion (manniom@martin.k12.fl.us)

Administration will monitor fidelity of implementation of BEST Standards and adopted curriculum using classroom walkthrough tool to provide feedback and plan PD as needed to support teachers.

Person Responsible	Susanna Deutsch (deutscs@martinschools.org)

School based reading interventionists and tutors will obtain and analyze current data to target specific skill deficits in ELA. They will use data to group students by need, plan and deliver skill based, differentiated small group instruction in grades 3-5 using research based resources.

Person Responsible	Aimee Morrell (morrela@martin.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development in Student Teaming to develop student interaction, collaboration, academic vocabulary, engagement, and comprehension will be scheduled for instructional staff and will be implemented in a layered approach with ongoing coaching/monitoring from the organization providing the PD.

Person Responsible	Susanna Deutsch (deutscs@martinschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	42% of students in grades 3-5 scored in levels 3 and above on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math, the remaining 58% of students scored a level 1 or 2. 33% of our students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 demonstrated a learning gain on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math. 25% of our students in the ESE subgroup and 24% of our students in the ELL subgroup scored in levels 3 and above on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in math.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above on the 2022-2022 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3 will increase from 42% to 47%, thereby reducing the percentage of students scoring levels 1 or 2 to 53% or less. The percentage of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 will increase from 33% to 41% on the 2022-2023 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3. The percentage of students in the ESE and ELL subgroups in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above on the 2022-2023 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3 will increase from 25% to 35% and 24% to 34% respectively.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The 2022-2023 administration of the grade 3-5 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM 3 in Math is will be how we determine if we have met the minimum desired outcome. We will progress monitor throughout the year using FAST PM 1-2, Savvas unit tests, and common formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susanna Deutsch (deutscs@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Professional development in research based instructional practices that impact student engagement, learning, and achievement. 2. PLC focused on backward planning to ensure lessons, activities, and assessments are aligned to BEST standards. 3. Professional development in understanding BEST Standards, including what is expected of the teacher and learner and how to supplement the current curriculum to meet the BEST standards.

4. Use of prescriptive math software program (Successmaker) to close individual gaps or enrich.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Student overall performance data on standardized assessment indicates there is a need for improvement in tier 1 practices including planning (the alignment of BEST Standards with the curriculum being used) and monitoring of student progress toward meeting Standards.

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.

1. Coaches will provide modeling, PLC planning support, coaching, and one on one planning sessions to improve teaching practices. Coaches and interventionists will support the use of formative and summative assessments for progress monitoring. This can include artifacts such as checklists, SuccessMaker data, pre and post-assessments, conferencing notes, and exit tickets.

| **Person Responsible** | Aimee Morrell (morrela@martin.k12.fl.us) |

2. Coaches will provide modeling, PLC planning support, coaching, and one on one planning sessions to assist teachers in developing strategy lessons, Number Talks, mini-lessons, and math conferences. Professional development will be provided based on teacher and student data.

| **Person Responsible** | Aimee Morrell (morrela@martin.k12.fl.us) |

4. School based math interventionists and tutors will obtain and analyze current data to target specific skill deficits in math. They will use data to group students by need, plan and deliver skill based, differentiated small group instruction in grades 3-5 using a variety of intervention resources such as Savvas supports and SuccessMaker Math.

| **Person Responsible** | Gordon Laing (laingg@martinschools.org) |

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	38% of students in grade 5 scored a level 3 or higher on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment. 22% of our students in the ESE subgroup and 16% of our students in the ELL subgroup scored in levels 3 and above on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The percentage of students in grade 5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 38% to 48% on the 2022-2023 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment. The percentage of students in grade 5 ESE and ELL subgroups scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 22% to 42% and 16% to 35% respectively on the 2022-2023 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will progress monitor throughout the year using Science PMTs through Performance Matters, unit tests and district common formative assessments. Instruction will be monitored by planning in PLC's, classroom walkthroughs, observations, and progress monitoring assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Professional development in research based instructional practices that impact student engagement, learning, and achievement. 2. Science Teacher will support with planning to increase the rigor of standards based instruction during the science block. 3. Implementation of hands on inquiry lessons and push in support by the Science lab teacher that ties in with each standard based unit of study.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Science Teacher and District Science Coordinator support teachers in understanding grade appropriate rigor and developing lesson plans to ensure comprehension of science standards. Hands-on inquiry lessons and experiments is a method of instruction where students are guided to gain knowledge by experience. It improves retention of content and vocabulary.

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.

Purposeful, common planning with teachers for effective standards based instruction which would include specific structures to facilitate conversation and deliberate planning of monitoring strategies, identifying critical information, and key questions. This would include providing support in identifying Power (essential) Standards, using Science Documents in planning for standards based instruction, and providing support in branches of science content to increase the knowledge about a specific topic.

Person Responsible	Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)

All teachers will implement hands-on inquiry lessons to tie in with standard based units of study.

Person Responsible	Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Science Teacher and District coach will model lessons or provide support to teachers during hands on inquiry or experiments.

Person Responsible   Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

23% of students in K-2 are not on track based on the 2022 Interim 4 Benchmark Advanced Assessment. Therefore, our Area of Focus is to increase the number of students on track by providing additional support.

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

39% of students in grades 3-5 scored levels 3 and above on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA, the remaining 61% of students scored a level 1 or 2.
35% of our students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 demonstrated a learning gain on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA)
22% of our students in the ESE subgroup and 23% of our students in the ELL subgroup in grades 3-5 scored levels 3 and above on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA)
Therefore, our Area of Focus is to increase overall reading proficiency for all subgroups.

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

60% of students in grades K-2 will score 40 PR (a or above level) as evidenced by the Renaissance Star Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 39% to at least 44% on the 2022-2023 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3 in ELA, thereby reducing the percentage of students scoring levels 1 or 2 to 50% or below.

The percentage of students in the lowest quartile demonstrating a learning gain in grades 3-5 will increase from 35% to 41% on the 2022-2022 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3.

The percentage of students in the ESE and ELL subgroups in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 22% to 32% and 23% to 33% respectively on the 2022-2023 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM 3.

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The 2022-2023 administration of the grade 3-5 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM 1-3 ELA is how we will determine if we have met the minimum desired outcome. Throughout the year we will be reviewing data from these assessments in addition to Benchmark Advance unit and weekly assessments (k-5), MTSS progress monitoring, and additional layered intervention data (K-5).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Deutsch, Susanna, deutscs@martinschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
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. Â§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?

1. Intentionally planned student centered and small group differentiated instruction.
2. Phonological Awareness/Phonics/Word Study curriculum across grade levels.
3. Professional development for all teachers and ELL paraprofessionals in the use of ACCESS data and to implement ELL strategies that utilize "can do" descriptors to support and enhance their learning.
4. District instructional coaching cycles and administrative walk throughs to provide feedback and support in standards based instruction and grade appropriate rigor.
5. Identified students will be provided an additional layer of reading support (ESE, ELL, non-proficient).
6. After school tutoring for identified students needing additional support based on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA assessment and initial Benchmark Advance Assessments.
7. PLC focused on backward planning to ensure lessons, activities, and assessments are aligned to BEST standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

1. Using current student data to develop groups to address learning gaps or enrichment during small group instruction.
2. Data shows a deficit in phonological awareness, phonics, and/or vocabulary which is being addressed by systematically implementing Heggerty (K-1), Wilson Fundations (K-2), and/or Benchmark Advance phonological awareness/phonics/word study curriculum (K-5).
3. Use of ACCESS of ELLs "Can Do" descriptors will clarify for teachers and paraprofessionals activities to assign ELL students that are appropriate for their level of language acquisition.
4. Coach teachers to identify and plan for the rigor of the standards.
5. Additional supports for identified students using 21-22 data and current performance data, in the forms of after school tutoring and/or an interventionist will be provided and monitored to close learning gaps.
6. Increase proficiency of teachers in delivery of instruction by designing their lesson plans using backwards planning.

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
District instructional coach will provide modeling, coaching cycles, one on one planning sessions, and support grade level PLC planning to develop teachers understanding and implementation of curriculum, formative and summative assessments, and instructional practices.	Mannion, Maureen, manniom@martin.k12.fl.us
District instructional coach will support teachers accessing, understanding/analyzing WIDA Access Data and implementation of Benchmark Advanced ELL Support to intentionally plan for ELL student instruction at their zone of proximal development.	Mannion, Maureen, manniom@martin.k12.fl.us
School based reading interventionists and tutors will obtain and analyze current data to target specific skill deficits in ELA. They will use data to group students by need, plan and deliver skill based, differentiated small group instruction in grades 3-5 using research based resources.	Mannion, Maureen, manniom@martin.k12.fl.us
Professional Development in Student Teaming to develop student interaction, collaboration, academic vocabulary, engagement, and comprehension will be scheduled for instructional staff and will be implemented in a layered approach with ongoing coaching/monitoring from the organization providing the PD.	Morrell, Aimee, morrela@martin.k12.fl.us
Administration will monitor fidelity of implementation of BEST Standards and adopted curriculum using classroom walkthrough tool to provide feedback and plan PD as needed to support teachers.	Deutsch, Susanna, deutscs@martinschools.org

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Pinewood theme for the new year is Keep Kind in Mind. PBIS will be doing many events and activities around our kind theme that will benefit both our staff and our students. Events include a Kind themed book at each grade level for read alouds, catching students being kind and recognizing them on our morning news, kindness theme lessons monthly, snack carts for teachers and a staff bulletin board for getting to know each other. We hope to spread a little kindness throughout campus.
A Meet the Teacher event was held for parents to meet their child's teacher and begin an open, positive communication between families and teachers. Curriculum Night was held for parents to be introduced to and ask questions about the new Benchmark curriculum as well as previously established curriculum, and classroom procedures. Growth Mindset work continues at school and is encouraged to be used at home. We hold several family school events that include social, cultural, as well as academic events. Events include Family Heritage Night, School Trivia Night, dances, STEM Night, and Literacy Night.
Character Counts Pillars are taught reviewed throughout the year. They will be supported through read alouds by teachers, guidance counselors, administrators, and special community guests. We also hold Student of the Month celebrations based on the Character Counts Pillar of the month for our students with their families.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Stakeholders include students, families, teachers, administrators, volunteers, early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners, and school board members. All stakeholders share the roles of being positive, visible, communicating, listening, sharing, and working together. In doing the aforementioned, we create a positive school culture and environment that reflects a supportive and successful learning environment for our students. Stakeholders are invited to attend SAC, attend PTA, volunteer, and attend all PWE events. We value the knowledge and expertise of all stakeholders.