

Brevard Public Schools

Pinecrest Academy Space Coast School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pinecrest Academy Space Coast

7550 STADIUM PARKWAY, Viera, FL 32940

www.pinecrestspacecoast.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Offering children a state-of-the-art education focusing on a rigorous curriculum with an emphasis on STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) disciplines enhanced by a Spanish dual language program that will create biliterate citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Creating biliterate thinkers to succeed in a global community."

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barringer, Heather	Principal	
Hammoud, Wendy	Instructional Coach	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

During preplanning, the entire instructional staff completed an activity where we looked at the longitudinal data for the last 3 years. During this time we looked at subjects, subgroups, and cohorts. This helped to delineate which areas of improvement were most pressing. As a collective team, we put big ideas together for what needed to be monitored and improved upon immediately for this school year. Then, the big ideas were taken to a workshop with the department chairs and our leadership team to determine what the goals would be. The goals were then taken to the School Advisory Council for approval.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

All teachers and instructional assistants will be given a copy of the School Improvement Plan. A copy of the SIP goals will be hung around the school, so all stakeholders are aware of the goals and the expected growth. A progress monitoring program is in place for each of the measured goals. This progress monitoring will be done 3 times per year. After each administration, the data will be analyzed and compared to the SIP goals to see if any adjustments need to be made. The leadership team and

department chairs will be an integral part of this process. Any changes will be brought before the School Advisory Council.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	7	9	2	5	4	7	4	4	3	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	0	1	3	0	1	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	6	6	14	11	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	9	17	8	3	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	10	6	6	14	11	0	47

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	2	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	9	2	8	7	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	1	16	9	9	4	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	2	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	8	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	9	2	8	7	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	1	16	9	9	4	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67	58	53	69	63	55	78		
ELA Learning Gains				61			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			45		
Math Achievement*	70	62	55	70	40	42	70		
Math Learning Gains				61			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			42		
Science Achievement*	66	61	52	61	64	54	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	87	72	68	90	61	59	84		
Middle School Acceleration	87	70	70	82	51	51	86		
Graduation Rate		87	74		62	50			
College and Career Acceleration		75	53		76	70			
ELP Progress		47	55		68	70			

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	575
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	50			
HSP	79			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	63			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	78			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	42			
HSP	77			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	67			70			66	87	87			
SWD	37			41			39	64			5	
ELL	65			76							2	
AMI												
ASN	92			92							2	
BLK	62			44			45				3	
HSP	76			82			72	77	93		6	
MUL	73			82			68	90	85		6	
PAC												
WHT	62			65			64	88	88		6	
FRL	58			54			57	92	73		6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	69	61	44	70	61	37	61	90	82			
SWD	43	54	42	36	39	33	17					
ELL	60	79		93	79							
AMI												
ASN	90			90								

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	57	44		52	38	20						
HSP	78	69	73	78	67		71	100	80			
MUL	74	50		66	67		73		91			
PAC												
WHT	67	62	46	69	60	30	62	91	84			
FRL	55	50	35	50	49	39	42	79	61			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	78	62	45	70	48	42	53	84	86			
SWD	61	55		39	36							
ELL	50			100								
AMI												
ASN	92			92								
BLK												
HSP	81	58		81	58							
MUL	77	64		57	25							
PAC												
WHT	76	63	50	69	52	44	50	94	77			
FRL	50	40		40	40							

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	65%	59%	6%	54%	11%
07	2023 - Spring	65%	53%	12%	47%	18%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	47%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	58%	17%
06	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	47%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	56%	12%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	64%	67%	-3%	54%	10%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	48%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	60%	13%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	61%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	38%	42%	55%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	55%	13%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	66%	48%	18%	44%	22%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	57%	-4%	51%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	51%	39%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	50%	45%	48%	47%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	63%	15%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	69%	17%	66%	20%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Science proficiency showed the lowest performance. We had all 7th graders take advanced science which increased the amount of students that took the exam. Some of our 7th graders do have a significant reading deficiency. Also, these tests cover 3 years worth of material. Science scores have been a low performance area for our school longitudinally.

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

Our Math scores have shown the greatest decline. With a student population that is 21% SWD, we have a number of students that are not reading on grade level. We have decreased by 4% proficiency since last year.

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

Based on the analysis of Math scores, it would appear that more emphasis needs to be given to Math, including our most struggling readers in the lowest 25%.

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

Science proficiency increased by 5% proficiency points. This year we started progress monitoring science for all students grade 3 through 8.

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

Our areas of concern include:

1. Substantial Reading Deficiencies
2. Students who score a Level 1 on ELA FAST

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

Our highest priorities are:

1. Math Proficiency
2. ELA Reading Proficiency
3. Growth of bottom 25%

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

A substantial number of students declined in FSA scores/levels in ELA and Math during the 2022-2023 school year. In ELA, Pinecrest saw a decline of 2% points going from 69% proficiency to 67%. In Math, there was decline of 4% point going from 70% proficient to 66%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With a focus on benchmark-based instruction, 70% of the students will demonstrate proficiency in ELA and Math on the PM 3 administration of the FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Data chats comparing FAST and I Ready data will be conducted after the administration of each progress monitoring window. Biweekly mtss meetings will be held to look at student progress and to ensure that benchmarks are being mastered as well as interventions are happening.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Benchmark-based instruction helps guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of student learning. Expectations for student learning are mapped out with each prescribed benchmark through subject pacing guides. Teachers follow benchmark-based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Instructional coaching cycles will be completed on all new teachers as well to ensure that benchmark-based instructional practices and lessons are taking place in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) has spent an enormous amount of resources, money and time researching and training in benchmark-based instruction. Data is demonstrating the benefit in this approach.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Expect teachers to use differentiated instruction based on day-to-day data in order to accelerate learning.

Person Responsible: Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: daily expectation

During data chats, special notice will be given to the students identified in bubble categories as well as the progress of students that achieved a level 4 or 5 last year. This will ensure no regression in their learning.

Person Responsible: Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: By October 1

When reviewing data during data chats, special attention will be placed on the progress of all groups to ensure that all groups are showing improvement. Groups/Students not showing progress will be recommended for after school tutoring.

Person Responsible: Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: On going

Teachers will meet with students after each progress monitoring test to review the data and establish goals for the next test administration.

Person Responsible: Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: Three times per year after each administration

Screen all level 4 and 5 students for gifted testing to ensure their academic skills are being challenged and addressed

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: December 1

Celebrate success of learning gains throughout the year during progress monitoring

Person Responsible: Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: after each diagnostic administration

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Upon analysis, our lowest 25% quartile students schoolwide showed a lower performance in learning gains related to their peers' school-wide. Many of these students fall into the SWD category.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With a focus on standards-based instruction and small group instruction, 60% of the Math and ELA students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains as evidenced by the results of the 2024 FAST administration.

Monitoring:

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

I-Ready data will be administered three times. Data chats will be held among grade levels, grade level team leaders and administrators. Teachers will utilize the data to create and conduct small group instruction around remediation and enrichment. Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers on how the data is modifying instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Small group instruction usually follows whole group instruction to reinforce or reteach specific skills and concepts and provides a reduced student-teacher ratio. Small groups typically range in size from four to six students.

1. Personalize Instruction:

Small group instruction allows teachers to work more closely with each student. This type of instruction provides the opportunity to evaluate students' learning strengths, locate gaps in the development of their reading or math skills and tailor lessons focused on specific learning objectives. In addition, small group instruction allows teachers to check for understanding, reinforce skills presented in whole group instruction, and/or change the pacing of a lesson (i.e., teachers may break down concepts not easily understood or quickly pass through lessons that students clearly understand).

2. Provide Feedback:

Small group instruction allows a teacher to monitor student actions more closely and to provide frequent and individualized feedback at point of use to improve specific reading or math skills.

3. Reteach or Preteach:

Small group instruction is an opportunity for teachers to provide additional teaching and practice often needed for struggling students to master important skills or understand key concepts (e.g., phonemic awareness skill of manipulating ending sounds, or operations with whole numbers or rational numbers). Through the use of diagnostic assessments, a teacher can determine skills or concepts for which students may need more instructional support. Small group instruction also provides an opportunity for teachers to pre-teach specific vocabulary, challenging text structures, or other prerequisite knowledge to English learners or any students who may experience difficulty in upcoming lessons.

4. Build Confidence Through Collaboration:

Small group instruction can provide a comfortable environment and boost the confidence of students who might not otherwise participate in a lesson or activity. Small group instruction encourages teamwork as everyone in the group is working toward achieving the same goal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has shown that unless students are provided additional instruction to fill learning gaps, the chances of achieving grade level standards is challenged. Of great importance is the ability to also target the enrichment students through this strategy, as often times, the remediation approach negatively impacts those on grade level and above.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Instructional assistants will be assigned to classes during ELA and/or Math time in grade 3 in order to assist the teachers with small group interventions.

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: By the first day of school

Full-time instructional assistants will be assigned to all K-2 classes in order to assist teachers with small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: By the first day of school

Teachers will create an intervention schedule that supports his/her academic areas. Students will rotate through groups to receive additional instruction and support.

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: By October 1

Students not demonstrating adequate progress will be referred to the IPST team for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: by end of first quarter

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our overall science proficiency rate was higher than the district and state, a huge improvement over last year's comparison. Our overall proficiency in science is 66%, which is 5% higher than the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With a focus on professional learning communities, 75% of 5th grade students will demonstrate proficiency as evidenced by the results of the 2022-2023 state assessment, while 75% of our 8th graders will demonstrate proficiency in the Biology EOC

Monitoring:

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

Using the MAPS progress monitoring tool, teachers will determine the gaps in learning and provide differentiated lessons and activities

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A professional learning community (PLC) involves much more than a staff meeting or group of teachers getting together to discuss a book they've read. Instead, a PLC represents the institutionalization of a focus on continuous improvement in staff performance as well as student learning. Called "the most powerful professional development and change strategy available," PLCs, when done well, lead to reliable growth in student learning. In a nutshell, PLCs entail whole-staff involvement in a process of intensive reflection upon instructional practices and desired student benchmarks, as well as monitoring of outcomes to ensure success. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A professional learning community, or PLC, is a group of educators who decide to come together regularly to learn with and from each other on needs they have identified themselves. They talk about the value of collaboration and how their PLC have helped them stay connected and supported.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Continue the engagement students in STEM through STEM Scopes curriculum and a separate STEAM program offered as a weekly special.

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: first day of school

Create a STEM-themed poster that highlights the STEM objectives being highlighted throughout the other disciplines

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: preplanning

Have the instructional coach attend grade level meetings with teachers to ensure vertical alignment of grades 3-5 science instruction as well as 6-8 science instruction and Biology.

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: by the end of the first quarter

Develop a non-negotiable schedule that requires teachers to meet and plan during common planning periods

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: preplanning

Utilize the instructional coach in observing, providing feedback and modeling for new and struggling teachers.

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: by September 1

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Pinecrest will have a positive culture as evidenced by a 5% or less teacher turnover.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher retention will be looked at and considered in all decision making. Culture and climate surveys will be sent to teacher twice a year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A positive reward system will be utilized for out teachers as incentives for job performance. For example, the grade level with the most i-Ready lessons completed wins a jeans day each week. Elevating leaders within the building to recognize teacher strengths. Also, ongoing professional growth and development opportunities will be available to ensure that teachers feel prepared and know the expectations. This will make them feel confident in their work.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When teachers/employees have a part in the decision making process, they feel an ownership in the solutions and processes. This also allows people to feel more connected to a place which makes them want to stay.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Each week a teacher will be recognized for something excellent they are doing

Person Responsible: Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: ongoing weekly throughout the year

teachers will be given rewards when students achieve different milestones and incentives

Person Responsible: Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: ongoing throughout the year

allow for teachers to get subs to observe other teachers to help with professional growth and development

Person Responsible: Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: ongoing throughout the year

Develop a strong mentor program for teachers who are teaching 3 years or less

Person Responsible: Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

By When: preplanning

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Esser funds are being used to fund all Instructional Assistants that are being used in the classroom. A quarterly budget review is completed with the budget team to ensure all money is being spent appropriately and allocations are being used wisely. If there are any changes that need to be made, they go through the budget team and ultimately get voted on by the board.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

All students are receiving their required 90 minutes reading block and being taught with a benchmark-based, researched based curriculum. After review of our schedule from last year, the decision was made to increase the instructional minutes by 15 minutes each day to ensure extra time for writing with a benchmark-based, researched based curriculum. A robust Response to Intervention (RTI) time is included in the schedule each day and biweekly MTSS meetings are held to analyze the RTI data to ensure proper interventions are happening, mastery of standards is happening, and students are placed in the correct intervention groups. Also, data is analyzed after each administration of the FAST and i-Ready Diagnostic and data chats are had with all stakeholders.

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

All students are receiving their required 90 minutes reading block and being taught with a benchmark-based, researched based curriculum. After review of our schedule from last year, the decision was made to increase the instructional minutes by 15 minutes each day to ensure extra time for writing with a benchmark-based, researched based curriculum. A robust Response to Intervention (RTI) time is included in the schedule each day and biweekly MTSS meetings are held to analyze the RTI data to ensure proper interventions are happening, mastery of standards is happening, and students are placed in the correct intervention groups. Also, data is analyzed after each administration of the FAST and i-Ready Diagnostic and data chats are had with all stakeholders.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

i-Ready Diagnostics and STAR Reading/Early Literacy are administered each student three times per year. For each student we look at score and growth. This determines much of the direction of the benchmark-based lesson planning. Data chats are held with all stakeholders to ensure the proper support for students to be successful. Free tutoring is offered for our lowest 25%. Any students who is demonstrating a substantial deficiency is also recommended to our IPST team for child find. Our robust MTSS teams meet biweekly to look at data collected through RTI to ensure that students are receiving the interventions necessary and are placed in groups appropriately.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

i-Ready Diagnostics and FAST are administered each student three times per year. For each student we look at score and growth. This determines much of the direction of the benchmark-based lesson planning. Data chats are held with all stakeholders to ensure the proper support for students to be successful. Free tutoring is offered for our lowest 25%. Any students who is demonstrating a substantial deficiency is also recommended to our IPST team for child find. Our robust MTSS teams meet biweekly to look at data collected through RTI to ensure that students are receiving the interventions necessary and are placed in groups appropriately.

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

The school uses a progress monitoring system (i-Ready) in addition to state administered tests. With each administration of the FAST/STAR and i-Ready Diagnostic (3 times per year) student data is analyzed and shared. Instruction and intervention are then adjusted based on results.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Barringer, Heather, hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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

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

The school uses a progress monitoring system (i-Ready) in addition to state administered tests. With each administration of the FAST/STAR and i-Ready Diagnostic (3 times per year) student data is analyzed and shared. Instruction and intervention are then adjusted based on results. In addition, the MTSS teams meet biweekly to look at data collected through the Response to Intervention Process. The data is analyzed and then student groups and/or goals are adjusted approximately every 6 weeks. The curriculums used for this process are taken directly from the suggested curriculums on the district decision trees. The ELA curriculum that we use is Benchmark Advance, which is the same as the district, which is in line with the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan for Brevard County. We also use i-Ready for diagnostic and curriculum purposes which is also in the plan for interventions and concurrent scoring.

Rationale:

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

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

These programs are completely in line with the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan for Brevard County. The i-ready tool box that we utilize creates an intuitive unique student pathway designed by the results from each student's diagnostic and is adjusted with each administration. The use of the curriculums from the district designed decision trees shows proven results within our Response to Intervention and Multi-Tiered System of Support with our students.

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
A Reading Coach was hired for the 2023-2024 school year	Barringer, Heather, hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com
An Student Services Specialist was hired for the 2023-2024 school year to coordinate and Improve our Response to Intervention and MTSS programs	Barringer, Heather, hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com
We purchased PSI and PASI for use in our MTSS/RTI program	Barringer, Heather, hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com
We are using Benchmark Advance Unit Exams with fidelity in all grades	Barringer, Heather, hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com
Data Chats are being held with students, not just teachers	Barringer, Heather, hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com

Title I Requirements**Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

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

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

We employ a full time guidance counselor and a school social worker who see students on a regular basis, teach lessons to students, hold special groups for students for students to help support their needs.

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

We will be implementing dual enrollment for our middle school this year

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

We will be implementing an IPST process for behaviors and writing behavior intervention plans for students who need more support as identified by teachers and staff.

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

This year our professional development will focus mainly on the Science of Reading, Classroom Management and Positive Behavior Intervention Systems. Many of our teachers are new to the profession and need professional development in the pedagogical aspects of the job. We decided to start with classroom management and positive behavior intervention systems because without these, you cannot be effective with the rest. We will be studying the Science of Reading, based on different grade levels, due to the new mandate. Also, it is imperative that elementary teachers truly know how to teach reading. This will help our students improve all around.

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

We follow a Leader in Me strategy called The First 8 Days. During the first 8 days of school, the focus is on procedures, expectations, and getting to know the school and staff.