

Orange County Public Schools

Pine Hills Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Hills Elementary

1006 FERDELL RD, Orlando, FL 32808

<https://pinehillses.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: LaTonya Smothers

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Hills Elementary

1006 FERNDILL RD, Orlando, FL 32808

<https://pinehillses.ocps.net/>

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-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	96%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Smothers, Latonya	Principal	Latonya Smothers, the Principal, provides a common vision for using standards-based instruction and data-driven decisions and ensures that the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process with fidelity. Ms. Smothers delivers actionable feedback to teachers and staff to improve instructional best practices. Ms. Smothers also assumes the responsibility and accountability for planning, developing, and implementing instructional programs and activities designed to achieve school goals. She collaborates with the assistant principal, resource teachers, and teachers to identify problems and concerns for which training and support may be needed to address those problems and concerns. She also supervises and evaluates personnel in terms of their performance and responsibilities supporting school-wide goals.
Adkins, Joshua	Assistant Principal	Joshua Adkins, Assistant Principal, assists the principal in the implementation of the common vision and ensures that the staff is implementing standards-based instruction and providing intervention and enrichment to students as needed. She also supervises and evaluates personnel in terms of their performance and responsibilities supporting school-wide goals.
Jones, Vilma	Instructional Coach	Instructional support for K-2 ELA. Support teachers in building lessons and assessments. Conducts nonevaluative feedback, completes coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), classroom walkthroughs, provides professional development.
Slee, Anne	Instructional Coach	Anne Slee is the Instructional Coach. Her responsibilities include side by side coaching with struggling teachers, testing coordinator to include school-wide iReady and FSA testing for grades K-5. She assists teachers with analyzing and disaggregating student data for grouping students during interventions. Ms. Slee ensures that teachers receive adequate teaching resources and is responsible for textbook inventory. Ms. Slee also facilitates the "New Achievers" beginning teacher program. Provides non-evaluative feedback, completes coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), classroom walkthroughs, and provides professional development.
Baldwin, LaDawn	ELL Compliance Specialist	To assist in the coordination of eligibility and placement for ESOL at the District level, to assist in the maintenance of an efficient system of staffing for all ESOL students, and to provide leadership for improving instruction in ESOL.
Jones, Antwanette	Instructional Coach	Instructional support for K-5 Writing. Support teachers in building lessons and assessments. Conducts nonevaluative feedback, completes coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), classroom walkthroughs, provides professional development.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Newcomer, Theresa	Staffing Specialist	Meets all requirements and compliance items for ESE students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/28/2020, LaTonya Smothers

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.*

0

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

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

655

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

16

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

10

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	43	108	87	162	64	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	9	50	40	70	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	6	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	26	11	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	1	0	33	9	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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	87	109	102	83	111	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
Attendance below 90 percent	1	33	17	22	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	34	17	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in Math	1	34	17	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	24	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	1	33	17	27	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	87	109	102	83	111	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
Attendance below 90 percent	1	33	17	22	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	34	17	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in Math	1	34	17	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	24	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	1	33	17	27	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	35%	56%	56%				40%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						55%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						50%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	46%	50%				51%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	40%						59%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						50%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	27%	61%	59%				50%	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	29%	55%	-26%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	63%	-11%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	53%	-8%
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	10	42		9	29						
ELL	36	64	50	37	36	40	20				
BLK	35	58	46	35	38	47	23				
HSP	31	58		35	40		44				
FRL	33	52	36	35	37	47	25				

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		13		4			15				
ELL	16	19	8	29	22	8	36				
BLK	21	27	26	22	19	9	32				
HSP	21	33		21	7		21				
FRL	20	27	25	24	18	5	33				
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	9	39	45	34	39		9				
ELL	25	47	50	50	64	55	26				
BLK	39	55	48	53	60	49	53				
HSP	44	48		42	46		27				
FRL	39	56	49	51	59	49	46				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	343
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
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?

Progress monitoring data (iReady) revealed positive trends in grade-level proficiency from the Beginning of the Year (BOY) to the End of the Year (EOY) in both ELA and math.

Math and ELA continue to be areas of focus with all grade levels averaging 38% (Math) and 40% (ELA) grade level proficiency across all three subgroups at the End of the Year (EOY).

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

Based on i-Ready data, there is a need to focus on foundational ELA skills such as comprehension of informational text and vocabulary.

Based on i-Ready data, there is a need to focus on foundational Math skills such as measurement, data, and geometry.

According to the 2021 Florida Standards Assessments, students in grades 3-5 performed the lowest in ELA 35% and Science Achievement with 27%

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

Contributing factors include the learning gaps developed during remote learning in 2019-20 school year and loss of instructional time while adapting to a digital learning environment for students and teachers in the 2020-21 school year. The Math/Science coach was not available for the first, preventing effective common planning, consistent classroom walkthrough observations to provide teachers with actionable feedback, and providing support throughout the coaching cycle.

New actions to address this need for improvement include focused professional development to strengthen the pedagogical knowledge of our instructional staff in support of standards-based reading/math instruction. This focused PD plan will be implemented and supported through weekly PLCs and monitored through the school-developed classroom walkthrough schedule.

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

The 2022 FSA data components reflected Math showing the most improvement. Students increased by 39% in Math Lowest 25th percentile, from 8% 2021 school year to 47% during the 2021-2022 school year.

Based on the i-Ready 2020-2021 End of the Year (EOY) diagnostic, Math showed the most improvement with a 35% increase in proficiency.

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

The contributing factors included implementing before- and after-school tutoring programs for grades 3-5 and increased daily targeted small-group math instruction. Teachers met weekly to discuss Tier One and Small Group instruction, Math interventions, and district resources to align with students' deficiencies.

During the intervention block, students were in ability groups and were provided tiered instruction from teachers, interventionists, and coaches.

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

Interventionists and Tutors will be utilized to push into classrooms to provide differentiated support to students

during small groups and the intervention block. There will be an intensive focus on the MTSS process where data for students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 instruction will be consistently collected and analyzed to provide targeted instruction to students. The accelerated learning model will be implemented during before-after-school tutoring to pre-teach academic lessons to students to prepare them

for upcoming standards. Individual teacher data meetings will be conducted quarterly, and grade level data meetings will be conducted bi-weekly to address teacher and student needs.

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.

Professional development opportunities will be provided to teachers throughout the 2022-2023 school year. Pine Hills' New Achievers Academy, a differentiated professional development session tailored to teacher needs, will be offered to teachers every month. Teachers can choose the learning path that will support their areas of improvement. Other professional development opportunities will focus on i-Ready/Symphony, classroom walkthrough data, common assessment data, interventions, and deliberate practice. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of classroom observations.

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

Pine Hills Elementary will provide morning and after-school tutoring for the lowest 25% and bubble students. During the intervention block, students will be ability grouped and provided tiered support by the classroom teachers and interventionists. To increase academic achievement, tiered coaching support will be provided to teachers based on content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management. Classroom walkthrough feedback will be provided to teachers with actionable feedback and follow-up. Bi-weekly data meetings will monitor student data and discuss the next steps.

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.

The 2022-2023 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) data indicated that 65% of students at Pine Hills Elementary scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). Currently, the overall school proficiency rate for ELA is 35%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The 2023 ELA FAST assessment will increase at least ten percentage points from the beginning of the year assessment to the end of the year assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored daily through summative and formative assessments such as teacher observations, learning checks, common assessments, i-Ready/FAST diagnostic, and standards-based item analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Teachers will be provided professional development on standards-based instruction and authentic engagement strategies to increase their pedagogy. Professional development will be presented in workshops and facilitated during common planning and the coaching cycle.

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

Teachers will intentionally plan for differentiated instruction for students' specific needs.
 This will also provide students with opportunities to receive immediate and corrective feedback.

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.

Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted regularly to provide ELA feedback. Adjustments will be made in common planning/PLCs as needed.

Person Responsible

Latonya Smothers (latonya.smothers@ocps.net)

PLCs will intensely focus on critical standards to ensure lessons are strategically aligned to the standard.

Person Responsible

Anne Slee (anne.slee@ocps.net)

The standards-based common assessment data will be used in PLCs to inform instructional decisions.

Person Responsible

Latonya Smothers (latonya.smothers@ocps.net)

#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.

The 2022-2023 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) data indicated that 64% of students at Pine Hills Elementary scored below a level 3 in Math. Currently, the overall school proficiency rate for Math is 36%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The 2023 Math FAST assessment will increase at least ten percentage points from the beginning of the year assessment to the end of the year assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored daily through summative and formative assessments such as teacher observations, learning checks, common assessments, Symphony Math/FAST diagnostic, and standards-based item analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers will be provided professional development on standards-based instruction and authentic engagement strategies to increase their pedagogy. Professional development will be presented in workshops and facilitated during common planning and the coaching cycle.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teachers will intentionally plan for differentiated instruction for students' specific needs. This will also provide students with opportunities to receive immediate and corrective feedback.

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.

Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted regularly to provide ELA feedback. Adjustments will be made in common planning/PLCs as needed.

Person Responsible

Latonya Smothers (latonya.smothers@ocps.net)

PLCs will intensely focus on critical standards to ensure lessons are strategically aligned to the standard.

Person Responsible

Anne Slee (anne.slee@ocps.net)

The standards-based common assessment data will be used in PLCs to inform instructional decisions.

Person Responsible

Latonya Smothers (latonya.smothers@ocps.net)

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

The following percentage of students did not meet proficiency based on the End-of-Year i-Ready Diagnostic for the 2021-2022 school year.

33% of the Kindergarten students

64% of students in 1st grade

67% of students in 2nd grade

Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters;
Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

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

The following percentage of students did not meet proficiency based on the 2022 ELA FSA for the 2021-2022 school year.

54% of students in 3rd grade

71% of students in 4th grade

71% of students in 5th grade

3rd grade:

Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters;
Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

4th-5th grades:

Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

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)

In 2022, 33% of our students in Kindergarten did not meet proficiency in ELA as assessed by the end-of-year ELA i-Ready Diagnostic. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide progress monitoring system, 75% of students in Kindergarten will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of students meeting proficiency to 8%.

In 2022, 64% of our first-grade students did not meet proficiency in ELA as assessed by the end-of-year ELA i-Ready Diagnostic. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide progress monitoring system, 55% of students in first grade will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of students meeting proficiency to 9%.

In 2022, 67% of our second-grade students did not meet proficiency in ELA as assessed by the end-of-year ELA i-Ready Diagnostic. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide progress monitoring system, 55% of students in second grade will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of students meeting proficiency to 12%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2022, 55% of our students in 3rd grade did not reach proficiency or a level 3 on ELA FSA. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide FAST, 55% of third-grade students will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of proficiency to 10% and decreasing the number of level 1s from 48 to 30.

In 2022, 71% of our students in 3rd grade did not reach proficiency or a level 3 on ELA FSA. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide FAST, 55% of fourth-grade students will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of proficiency to 16% and decreasing the number of level 1s from 47 to 30.

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.

Pine Hills Elementary will monitor various ways to evaluate the implementation of the action plan and the impact on student achievement.

Leadership team members will conduct weekly walkthroughs through reading and intervention instruction using the classroom walkthrough tool to determine data trends to guide decision-making related to professional development and classroom support.

Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and learning community

leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Smothers, Latonya, latonya.smothers@ocps.net

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?

For students in grades K-3, developing awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters and teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words meet Florida's strong level of evidence-based requirements as documented in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade. The above practices also align with the OCPs's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and the B.E.S.T. foundational reading benchmarks.

For students in grades 4 and 5, building students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words meet Florida's strong level of evidence-based requirements as outlined in the Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9. Providing this intervention to identified students aligns with OCPs's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan. Having the ability to decode multisyllabic supports B.E.S.T. reading and writing 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?

Teachers will use the district-created daily foundational reading slides to support the practice of teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. (Recommendation 3)

Heggerty will be used in K-2 classrooms to develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

The SIPPS program will be used as an intervention for identified students to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This program also builds students' decoding skills to read complex multisyllabic words.

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
Literacy Leadership Teams Monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.	Jones, Vilma, vilma.jones@ocps.net
Literacy Coaching The literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support, etc... to fit area(s) of need. The literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.	Jones, Vilma, vilma.jones@ocps.net
Assessments Use and analysis of: -FAST -iReady diagnostic -Heggerty Assessments -District created Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades K-2) Use of data to determine interventions and support needs of students	Slee, Anne, anne.slee@ocps.net
Professional Learning We will develop professional learning based on the needs of our classrooms. These plans include specific support for teachers based on progress monitoring data. District PD options available include literacy coach meetings, Coach B.E.S.T. Book study, K-5 ELA Impact Series.	Slee, Anne, anne.slee@ocps.net

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning and leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families through processes such as the School Advisory Council to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based, and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

Pine Hills Elementary will utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaison (Colita Smith) and the Social Worker (Alexis Starling) to help bridge the community and school culture. A core team of teachers (need names of teacher)) and administrators (Latonya Smothers and Josh Adkins) from the school, which includes a mental health designee, attend the SEL district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with the school-based team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps.