Pine Forest Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pine Forest Elementary School

3929 GRANT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/pineforest

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.

As a success-oriented school, Pine Forest School of the Arts drives academic achievement and nurtures artistic self-expression within a cooperative learning environment for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pine Forest School of the Arts: "Where the Arts and Academics Meet Center Stage"

Who We Are:
Pine Forest School of the Arts is a dedicated Magnet elementary school committed to excellence in both standards-based academics and the arts.

What We Do:
Pine Forest School of the Arts provides a Visual and Performing Arts program that helps promising students cultivate their passion and strengthen their talent for arts activities while ensuring academic excellence.

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
Matthews, Michelle	Principal	Instructional Leader, Operations Manager, School-Wide Communicator, MTSS Team Member, SAC Committee Member, PTA Board Member,
Smith, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	K-5 Math Teacher, Lead Technology Support Teacher, Professional Development Facilitator
Bolen, Juli	Teacher, ESE	Lead VE Teacher
Mattiace, Johna	Teacher, K-12	Lead Kindergarten Teacher, Primary Model Classroom Teacher
Napoleon, Olga	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Math/Science Teacher, Primary Math Model Classroom Teacher
Ledoux, Laurel	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Math/Science Teacher, Lead 3-5 Math Teacher, Model Classroom Math Teacher
Cobb-McCoy, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Operations Manager, Lead PBIS and Discipline Administrator, Testing Coodinator

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.

Our school's strategic plan data (including our Spring 2023 ELA, Math and Science FAST Scores) were reviewed by administration and teachers to develop our School Improvement Plan. It appears as if Math continues to be the area that requires the most focus and improvement in Grades 4 and 5.

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))

Once approved, the School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored during Common Planning sessions, Early Dismissal/Faculty Meetings and through our PTA and SAC committees as means of supporting our strategies and goals.

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)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	73%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B

	2017-18: B
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	0	27	25	20	20	23	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	18	21	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	31	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	21	32	22	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	14	11	10	14	26	0	0	0	75

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	1	1	3	0	4	1	0	0	0	10
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	40	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	40	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

(Grade Level columns: K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8)

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*	57	48	53	66	50	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				65			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			40		
Math Achievement*	47	58	59	62	48	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				58			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			15		
Science Achievement*	72	52	54	47	59	59	53		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

* 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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	235
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	24	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	67			
MUL	39	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	69			

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%
FRL	46			

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	48			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	69			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	49			

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	57			47			72					
SWD	24			18							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			33			62				4	
HSP	67			67							2	
MUL	41			36							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	68			56			84				4	
FRL	43			37			63				4	

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	66	65	44	62	58	43	47					
SWD	42	59		42	50		45					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	51	58	35	46	47	35	32					
HSP	95	64		79	36							
MUL	60			67								
PAC												
WHT	75	70		73	75		57					
FRL	54	62	41	50	51	45	42					

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	66	66	40	57	50	15	53					
SWD	37	67		33	25		27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	55	43	36	32	20	27					
HSP	84			84								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	71		73	63		71					
FRL	47	42	30	37	28	14	31					

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	64%	47%	17%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	50%	13%	58%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	46%	12%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	59%	7%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	58%	-7%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	52%	-17%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	72%	48%	24%	51%	21%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance during the 2022-2023 school year was 3rd-5th Grade Mathematics Proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance during the 2022-2023 school year was 5th Grade Mathematics.
Possible factors that contributed to this decline include less small-group instructional time to remediate

Math deficiencies, new state benchmarks, new curriculum, a new online state assessment tool, and extremely over-sized class sizes due to lack of funding for additional teachers.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th Grade Mathematics.

Possible factors that contributed to this decline include less small-group instructional time to remediate Math deficiencies, new state benchmarks, new curriculum, a new online state assessment tool, and extremely over-sized class sizes due to lack of funding for additional teachers.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement when compared to the state average during the 2022-2023 school year was 5th Grade Science.

Possible factors that contributed to this increase in proficiency include the 5th Grade Science teacher looping from 4th Grade with her students, the 5th Grade teacher's experience teaching 5th Grade Science in Duval and other counties in Florida, engaging, rigorous instruction including labs, progress monitoring through exit tickets and standards mini-assessments and an intense focus on the Nature of Science standards throughout the school year.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, two potential areas of concern include:
*4th and 5th Graders Scoring at Level 1 on the state-wide Math Assessment
*4th and 5th Graders Scoring at Level 1 on the state-wide ELA Assessment

These Early Warning System Data points were identified due to the fact that this year Learning Gains and Lowest Performing Quartile Gains will be also be calculated into the school's grade.

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

*4th/5th Grade Mathematics Learning Gains
*4th/5th Grade Mathematics Proficiency
*4th/5th Grade ELA Learning Gains
*3rd Grade ELA Proficiency

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 Math

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.

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

Our measurable goals for the 2023-2024 school year in the area of Math are as follows:
3-5 Math Proficiency: 55%
4-5 Math Learning Gains: 60%
4-5 Math LPQ Gains: 50%

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

This area of focus will be monitored through student assessment data (including District Monitoring Assessments, state Progress Monitoring Assessments and End of Unit Assessments). Administration will also monitor Math instruction in classrooms through weekly classroom walk-throughs and observations focusing on student-centered instruction and learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)

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.)

The evidence-based intervention for this Area of Focus will be our Benchmark Walk-Through Tool Data collected through our classroom visits and observations. Through the analysis of and monitoring of this data, we should see an increase throughout the year in the areas of instruction and monitoring student progress as a result of our common planning sessions, observations and feedback and other professional development opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Frequent classroom visits focused on instruction and progress monitoring of student performance will allow us to see if best practices and standards-based instruction are being implemented with fidelity. By reviewing student data, including analyzing how students answered questions, we will be able to correct misconceptions and provide remediation to students based on their individual performance.

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.

Weekly Benchmark Walk-Throughs and Classroom Observations in 3rd-5th Grade Math Classrooms

Person Responsible: Kimberly Cobb-McCoy (cobbk1@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 3, 2024

After-School Tutoring During Extended Day for 3rd-5th Grade Math Students

Person Responsible: Laurel Ledoux (ledouxl@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 26, 2024

Weekly Admin-Led Common Planning Sessions focused on student-centered learning and progress monitoring tools, daily small-group instruction and blended learning opportunities.

Person Responsible: Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 26, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

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

Our measurable goals for the 2023-2024 school year in the area of Math are as follows:
3-5 Math Proficiency: 55%
4-5 Math Learning Gains: 60%
4-5 Math LPQ Gains: 50%

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

This area of focus will be monitored through student assessment data (including District Monitoring Assessments, state Progress Monitoring Assessments and Weekly/End of Unit Assessments). Administration will also monitor ELA instruction in classrooms through weekly classroom walk-throughs and observations focusing on student-centered instruction and learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Cobb-McCoy (cobbk1@duvalschools.org)

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.)

Weekly Admin-Led Common Planning Sessions, including the development or review of supplemental materials will play a key role in maintaining our ELA proficiency and increasing the percentage of our students making Learning Gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

While our Core Reading curriculum contains more grade level text excerpts compared to past curriculum series, it lacks the amount of practice that students need answering questions that mirror what students will be exposed to on our state progress monitoring assessments. The only times that students engage in answering these types of questions are during the weekly and end of unit assessments. Too much time is spent on reading aloud, annotating text, and group discussions around the text. Students need more practice grappling with the text at an independent level, answering questions and then sharing their findings with their peers and class as a whole.

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.

Weekly Admin-Led Common Planning Sessions and participation in district-level professional development opportunities for ELA Planning.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Cobb-McCoy (cobbk1@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 26, 2024

Weekly Classroom Walk-Throughs and Observations in 3rd-5th Grade ELA Classrooms focused on student-centered learning: less reading aloud and more student ownership of learning.

Person Responsible: Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)

By When: March 29, 2024

Daily Teacher-Led, Small-Group Instruction for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 remediation.

Person Responsible: Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 26, 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

The Area of Focus in relation to ensuring a Positive Culture and Climate at Pine Forest involves increasing opportunities to celebrate our faculty, staff and students during the school year for reaching academic, behavior or attendance goals. Through these efforts, we will hopefully see a steady increase in our projected enrollment for the 2024-2025 school year.

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

Our current enrollment as of August 31, 2023 is as follows:
KDG: 67
1st: 80
2nd: 78
3rd: 83
4th: 94
5th: 98

Our goal is to increase our enrollment in all grade levels and retain our current students and families for the remainder of the elementary years. Transportation sometimes becomes an issue because bus transportation is only offered to two zones within our school district.

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

Through Home-School Communication and Parent/Family Involvement efforts, we hope to retain and possibly increase our student enrollment for the 2024-2025 school year.

We will work with the Office of School Choice to accept students from our wait lists during the Controlled Open Enrollment windows and continue to advocate for additional classroom teacher positions to lower class sizes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)

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.)

Frequent communication with the Office of School Choice during Controlled Open Enrollment windows will allow us to strategically increase our enrollment where we have room to do so for the upcoming school year.

Parent Engagement and Involvement are also key to retaining families. School-Wide newsletters, Bloomz, our website, social media pages and class/grade level newsletters will not only keep families informed but also share highlights of things that make our school unique and a great place to learn and grow.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

For years, the enrollment of students in public schools as opposed to charter and private schools has been on the decline. It is our hope to continue to promote not only throughout our district but in neighboring counties as well.

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.

Establishment of partnerships with local businesses and apartment complexes around our school's neighborhood and surrounding elementary schools.

Person Responsible: Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)

By When: January 2024

Establishment of partnerships with local music and dance studios to enhance our programs and recruit new families.

Person Responsible: Rachel Smith (smithr3@duvalschools.org)

By When: January 2024

Marketing and recruitment to nearby Pre-Kindergarten and Daycare facilities offering private tours and information specific to our Kindergarten programs.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Cobb-McCoy (cobbk1@duvalschools.org)

By When: January 2024