

District School Board of Madison County

Pinetta Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pinetta Elementary School

135 NE EMPRESS TREE AVE, Pinetta, FL 32350

<http://pes.madison.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Yolanda Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	94%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: D (38%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Madison 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pinetta Elementary School

135 NE EMPRESS TREE AVE, Pinetta, FL 32350

<http://pes.madison.k12.fl.us/>

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 PK-6	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Madison 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.

Our vision is to provide a positive, safe and motivating environment for children to learn. We believe that all children should enjoy their learning, achieve their potential, and become independent life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a positive, safe and motivating environment for children to learn. We believe that all children should enjoy their learning, achieve their potential, and become independent life-long learners.

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
Davis, Yolanda	Principal	The job and duties of the principal is to create a positive culture, create a long term plan for student academic success, cultivate leadership in others, improve school leadership, and manage data.
Ensminger, Elizabeth	Reading Coach	Provide support to Staff members Set up and conduct RTI Meetings Provide Training and Strategies during PLCs Non-Evaluative walkthroughs Make sure ALL information is in RTI Folders Help Staff Members make DATA Decisions Collective ALL Intervention Calendars monthly
Lee, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	Provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with the district's philosophy, goals, and objectives.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Yolanda Davis

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.*

1

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

10

Total number of students enrolled at the school

144

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

5

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

4

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	16	19	23	17	22	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	3	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	0	3	1	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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	17	23	16	22	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Attendance below 90 percent	17	18	8	7	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	5	5	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	2	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	5	4	1	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	6	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	17	23	16	22	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Attendance below 90 percent	17	18	8	7	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	5	5	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	2	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	5	1	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	5	4	1	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	6	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	38%	43%	56%				53%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	38%						45%	50%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile							33%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	39%	50%				66%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	28%						65%	49%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile							53%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	53%	59%				53%	56%	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	44%	40%	4%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	50%	7%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	46%	7%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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	60%	45%	15%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	51%	10%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	67%	44%	23%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	49%	42%	7%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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											
BLK	13			7							
WHT	49	39		68	43		50				
FRL	33	32		41	21		33				
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	30			40							
WHT	65	45		82	80		50				
FRL	55	69		66	83		40				
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	33	36		62	71		42				
BLK	30	33		32	53						
WHT	60	49	40	72	67	45	56				
FRL	51	40	23	62	63	46	57				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	188

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	0
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	10
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

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	50
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	32
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?

Over the last three years, data pulled from FSA and K-12 Lift show an overarching trend. Across all of the grade levels (K-5th) there is a deficiency among non-retainee grade level students who scored on or above grade level that shows a severe loss from school year to the next.

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

According to the k-12 lift data and FSA scores, students who are scoring at or above grade level are falling behind year after year. This is also shown within the past three years' iReady data. Also based on our FSA data our ELA and Math show the greatest need for improvement. 3rd Grade 4th Grade 5th Grade

2019-44% 57% 53%

2021-56% 50% 56%

2022-45% 38% 36%

3rd grade resulting in a 11% decrease in proficiency

4th grade resulting in a 12% decrease in proficiency

5th grade resulting in a 20% decrease in proficiency

3rd Grade 4th Grade 5th Grade

2019-60% 61% 34%

2021-61% 63% 67%

2022-45% 56% 44%

3rd grade resulting in a 16% decrease in proficiency

4th grade resulting in a 7% decrease in proficiency

5th grade resulting in a 23% decrease in proficiency

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

Last year, across the grade levels, classes were grouped in larger rotating groups (ie: 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade rotated, and K, 1st, and 2nd grade rotated). This scheduling led to consistent interruptions, transitions, and lost instruction time as a whole. When classes met for intense remediation, RTI, and MTSS; the majority of the time was spent on the lower quartile students to help them make the gains they needed. This allowed higher level students fall behind and lose ground. To combat this slide, we are grouping classes into smaller team rotations (ie rotating 5th and 6th grade), bringing rigorous instruction to push the on grade level students, and making sure the MTSS and team time schedule also focuses on pushing the higher level students.

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

According to the k-12 Lift, students who were below grade level made the most gains over the course of the last three years. According to the FSA Data, our 5th grade Science showed a 3% increase in proficiency

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

Over the last three years, we have been putting an emphasis on meeting the needs of the lower quartile students to help them make gains. While this makes a big difference, the on or above grade level students are falling behind.

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

In order to meet the needs of our on and above-grade-level students, while also immersing our lower quartile students, we need to implement standards-based instruction. This will allow teachers to focus entirely on one skill and bring in higher-order text-dependent questioning and rigor. Also, we will need to include differentiated and hands-on centers to bridge the gap between lower quartile students and our on or above-level students. During our "WIN" time we will have 2 adults in the classroom providing direct instruction to the students. We will also use Kagan Strategies every month.

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.

Throughout the year, we will hold PLC's to look at students data and make plans for how to best meet each student's needs. During these PLC's we will meet as a faculty and decide what needs each teacher has and pull book studies to meet those needs. We will also be attending Kagan training to learn the best practices for engaging students in their learning and make our classes hands-on.

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

Our school will begin Edmentum Exact Path which will include a digital component that meets each student's personal educational needs. We will also be continuing to utilize k12 Lift data to help drive our instruction and small group 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

<p>Area of Focus</p> <p>Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</p>	<p>Last year we were bridging the gap between the previous years standards and the new BEST standards. This led to a gap in rigorous teaching of specific standards and showed a deficiency in gains between the years data.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</p>	<p>Using the ELA FSA , Kagan Strategies, and k12 Lift data, we will increase our number of students who reach proficiency by 5%.</p>
<p>Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</p>	<p>We will use FAST progress monitoring assessment for grades 3rd-6th to determine student mastery of benchmarks and growth. We will also monitor each student's journey to proficiency by reviewing student learning paths in Edmentum Exact Path. We will also monitor student achievement of specific standards using USA Test Prep and by reviewing analyzed data through our partnership with K12 Lift.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Yolanda Davis (yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us)</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being</p>	<p>The evidence-based strategy we will use is standard based instruction lesson planning in which teachers will determine mastery by reviewing progress monitoring data.</p>

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

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

We believe that are teachers were successful in instructional practices, but struggled in ensuring lessons were standard based and would inevitably lead to student mastery. Therefore, we wanted to focus on making sure teachers planned effectively using a standard based instruction approach, monitored student mastery of standards, and revisited the lesson plans when necessary. Standard based instruction requires teachers to spend sufficient time planning the details of the lesson. Planning effectively requires the teachers to understand the standard, determine how they will teach the standard, and development an assessment which will be the evidence that students have mastered the standard. In addition, teachers will be able to review taught lessons and make adjustments to plans for instructional practices or delivery for a particular standard. Teachers who monitor for understanding have more success with student achievement because it provides teachers with the opportunity to "monitor and mend" student thinking processes and instructional practice when necessary. The new progress monitoring will seamlessly integrate with our current K12 lift data process and lesson planning template.

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.

Lesson plans will be monitored weekly to make sure they are data driven and based on specific standards. Bi-weekly walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure Kagan Strategies are being utilized in the classroom.

**Person
Responsible** Yolanda Davis (yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us)

Mrs. Davis will complete biweekly walk throughs on each teacher to make sure that standards based teaching is being met and Kagan Strategies

**Person
Responsible** Yolanda Davis (yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us)

#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 critical need from the data reviewed.

Increase proficiency and learning gains in fifth grade ELA. Last year only 38% of our fourth-grade students scored proficient on the Spring 2022 ELA FSA.

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

The school plans to achieve a minimum of 43% proficiency in ELA. and a minimum of 43% in overall learning gains.

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

The principal will review the progress monitoring data quarterly and share out with teachers during Professional Learning Communities or faculty meetings. Principal will also conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs and review lesson plans weekly and will look for Kagan Strategies integration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yolanda Davis (yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will use Kagan Strategies as the evidence-based strategy to accomplish this Area of Focus.

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

Kagan Strategies will assist in motivating a cooperative learning environment in the classroom and increasing student engagement. We believed are students are capable but may have struggled with engagement and required additional support to master standards. The Kagan Strategies, through the collaborative approach to instruction will feed into our instructional frame model: I do, We do, You do. Teachers will implement a monthly Kagan Strategy that will not only engage students in the learning process but provide them both teacher and peer support.

selecting this strategy.

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.

All teachers will receive professional development on Kagan Strategies. Most teachers will receive Kagan training from Kagan Representative. Others who are unable to attend will receive Kagan training during Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible Yolanda Davis (yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us)

Teachers will implement Kagan Strategies monthly, and the principal will see the Kagan strategy during walk-throughs.

Person Responsible Yolanda Davis (yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.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

Differentiated Instruction, Kagan Strategies, and Tutors. Each strategy ensures students' individual needs are met. Teachers will also have additional support during WIN time in each class.

Last year Kindergarten students were 25% on pace to learn a year's material in a year.

Last year First Graders were 55% on pace to learn a year's material in a year.

Last year Second Graders were 47% on pace to learn a year's material in a year.

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

Differentiated Instruction, Kagan Strategies, and Tutors. Each strategy ensures students' individual needs are met.

3rd Grade 4th Grade 5th Grade

2019-44% 57% 53%

2021-56% 50% 56%

2022-45% 38% 36%

3rd grade resulting in an 11% decrease in proficiency

4th grade resulting in a 12% decrease in proficiency

5th grade resulting in a 20% decrease in proficiency

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)

The school plans to have at least 50% of their K-2 students learn a year's material in a year's time on the STAR Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The school plans to achieve a minimum of 43% proficiency in ELA on the FAST Assessment PM3.

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 Area of Focus will be monitored through the K-12 Lift Data, FAST Data, and Star Assessment. The Principal will review lesson plans weekly. The principal will conduct bi-weekly walk-throughs. The school will implement monthly Kagan Strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Davis, Yolanda, yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us

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?

Some of the evidence-based programs we plan to use are Exact Path, Read Natural 2.0, Wonders, and Kagan Strategies. The programs support the K-12 Reading Plan and the 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?

Based on the Research of these programs it has been proved that if these students are taught Kagan Strategies, implemented Wonders, Read Natural, and Exact Path correctly. It should help increase student achievement.

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
Teachers will implement Kagan Strategies monthly.	Davis, Yolanda, yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us
Teachers will use the I Do; We Do You Framework.	Davis, Yolanda, yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us
The school will hire tutors to help with small groups.	Davis, Yolanda, yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us
Teachers will receive Professional Development from Edumentum on Exact Path.	Davis, Yolanda, yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us

5th and 6th Teachers will use Read Natural during Intervention Time for all students until LLI Curriculum is delivered. Tier 3 students will use LLI material.

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.

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders by establishing effective communication through the use of Class Dojo, Facebook, Peachjar, One Call and the school website. Additionally, the school will host events such as Open House, Literacy Nights, Donuts for Dad, Muffins for Mom, Fall Carnival, and various holiday programs, that will extend an invitation to show their support to our students. We will also have Parent Family Night where we will discuss student progress and suggestions on how to implement research based strategies which will assist in student achievement. We also have Monthly Celebrations with our staff and students.

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

The stakeholders are SAC Members, PTO Committee, Community Leaders, and Parents. The stakeholders role in promoting a positive culture environment is coming to the school and volunteering during our Monthly Celebrations, and other school activities, attending all meetings and events. Also the SAC members can provide funds to help support our faculty, staff, and students rewards. The stakeholders can also volunteer at the various events at