Pine Hills Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pine Hills Elementary

1006 FERNDELL RD, Orlando, FL 32808

https://pinehillses.ocps.net/

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.

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, 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
Smothers, Latonya	Principal	Latonya Smothers leads school improvement initiatives and ensures a safe learning environment for all staff and students. This includes creating a data-driven culture of understanding how data directly affects instructional decisions. Ms. Smothers also effectively manages and monitors Tier One instruction. Ms. Smothers oversees the implementation of the MTSS framework and regularly reviews new data to help struggling students. Ms. Smothers collaborates with the assistant principal, resource teachers, and District coaches to identify problems and concerns for which training and support may be needed to address those problems and concerns. Ms. Smothers also supervises and evaluates personnel regarding their performance and responsibilities in supporting school-wide goals. Ms. Smothers collaboratively engages with the district, staff, and community members to facilitate using resources that directly support the learning environment and impact student achievement.
Gray, Stefanie Ann	Assistant Principal	As the Assistant Principal, Mrs.Gray supports the Principal in all aspects of the school's operations. This includes fostering the success of staff and students by creating and sustaining a safe environment and student achievement. Mrs. Gray's primary function as an instructional leader is to monitor the implementation of a rigorous curriculum aligned to the Florida Standards leading to improved academic outcomes and school and student success. Mrs. Gray builds the capacity of academic coaches and teachers by facilitating professional learning opportunities and providing targeted, immediate feedback for improvement. As a member of the MTSS team, she ensures that each student is provided the support and services needed for success. Mrs. Gray also supervises and evaluates personnel regarding their performance and responsibilities supporting school-wide goals.
Slee, Anne	Instructional Coach	Anne Slee is the Instructional Coach and Testing Coordinator. Ms. Slee's responsibilities include side-by-side coaching with struggling teachers and overseeing schoolwide testing for grades K-5. Ms. Slee assists teachers with analyzing and disaggregating student data for grouping students for interventions. Ms. Slee ensures teachers receive adequate teaching resources and is responsible for textbook inventory. Ms. Slee also facilitates the "New Achievers" beginning teacher program. Ms. Slee provides non-evaluative feedback, completes the coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), classroom walkthroughs, and provides professional development.
Jackson, Keiaron	Dean	Mr. Jackson is responsible for the school-wide implementation of CHAMPS and Positive Behavior Intervention Services (PBIS) to enhance student behavior and citizenship. Mr. Jackson works closely with the administrative team to monitor behavior interventions, provide teachers with professional learning in managing behaviors, and facilitate mentoring programs. Mr. Jackson regularly reviews behavior data and recommends adjustments to the school-wide behavior framework and incentive plans based on this data.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Mr. Jackson supports teachers with data collection and analysis as a member of the MTSS team.
Swann, Deanna	Reading Coach	Deanna Swann, Reading Coach support for 3-5 ELA. Support teachers in building lessons and assessments. Conducts nonevaluative feedback, completes coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), classroom throughs, provides professional development
Louis, Kasheema	Math Coach	Kasheema Louis, Math Coach, support for 3-5 Math. Support teachers in building lessons and assessments. Conducts nonevaluative feedback, completes coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), classroom throughs, provides professional development

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.

The process for involving stakeholders involved sending out surveys, questionnaires, and parental concern forms. We used the responses to implement changes and address areas of concern within the SIP.

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))

We are monitoring the SIP by reviewing our data after every progress monitoring assessment and after standard-based unit assessments and using this data to make adjustments to Tier 1 instruction and interventions. Furthermore, we will also monitor the progress of Tier 1 instruction after the completion of coaching cycles to build capacity and implement best practices as mentioned in Professional Development training.

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 PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	4	47	42	31	29	21	0	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	0	5	6	5	13	4	0	0	0	33
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	3	55	27	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	52	26	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	40	38	40	55	0	0	0	0	174

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	1	21	20	19	62	24	0	0	0	147

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	0	1	2	3	17	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

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	9	50	40	70	16	22	0	0	0	207
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	15	1	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	6	46	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	11	46	0	0	0	83
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	1	0	33	9	40	0	0	0	83

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

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	9	50	40	70	16	22	0	0	0	207
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	15	1	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	6	46	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	11	46	0	0	0	83
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	1	0	33	9	40	0	0	0	83

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

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*	38	57	53	35	56	56	21		
ELA Learning Gains				57			30		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			28		
Math Achievement*	33	60	59	36	46	50	22		
Math Learning Gains				40			19		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			8		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	39	63	54	27	61	59	31		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	46	59	59	57			30		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	189
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	343
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	5	Yes	3	3
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	15	Yes	1	1
FRL	37	Yes	2	

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	18	Yes	2	2
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	38			33			39					46
SWD	10			5							3	
ELL	34			42			47				5	46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			33			37				5	45
HSP	34			32			45				5	48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	20			10							2	
FRL	37			33			39				5	45

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	35	57	44	36	40	47	27					57
SWD	10	42		9	29		0					
ELL	36	64	50	37	36	40	20					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	58	46	35	38	47	23					57
HSP	31	58		35	40		44					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33	52	36	35	37	47	25					57

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	21	30	28	22	19	8	31					30
SWD	0	13		4	0	0	15					
ELL	16	19	8	29	22	8	36					30

	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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	27	26	22	19	9	32					30
HSP	21	33		21	7		21					29
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	20	27	25	24	18	5	33					27

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	39%	54%	-15%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	60%	-10%	58%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	30%	52%	-22%	50%	-20%

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	37%	59%	-22%	59%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	62%	-17%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	15%	55%	-40%	55%	-40%

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	59%	-21%	51%	-13%

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 exhibited the lowest performance was the achievement level in Math. Over the past year, the percentage of students scoring three or higher dropped from 36% to 35%. This decline in Math achievement indicates a concerning student performance trend, potentially reflecting instructional strategies and challenges within Tier One instruction, small group, specifically standard-aligned instruction and foundational skills.

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

The data component that exhibited the greatest decline in performance was the achievement level in Math. Over the past year, the percentage of students scoring three or higher dropped from 36% to 35%. This decline in Math achievement indicates a concerning student performance trend, potentially reflecting instructional strategies and challenges within Tier One instruction, small group, specifically standard-aligned instruction and foundational skills.

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 comparison between school and state data in English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, and Science reveals notable differences in proficiency rates. According to the most recent available data, Florida's overall proficiency rate for students in these subjects is 53%. In contrast, Pine Hills Elementary displays significantly lower proficiency rates, with 42% in ELA, 36% in Mathematics, and 39% in Science. This decrease is attributed to students' reading ability and understanding of number sense.

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

Statewide Science Assessment showed the most improvement. Pine Hills ES scored 29% for overall proficiency for the 2022 school year and 39% for 2023, an overall increase of 10%. There was a strong correlation between Fifth Grade ELA reading proficiency and Fifth Grade Science proficiency. Students used Study Island with fidelity.

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

1. Lowering the amount of students who are absent 10% or more days
2. Decreasing the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency

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

1. Lowering the amount of students who are absent 10% or more days
2. Decreasing the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency
3. Decreasing Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment
4. Decreasing Level 1 on statewide Math assessment

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.

Teaching standard-based instruction remains a crucial area of focus.
On the most recent Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), data indicated that 42% of students in grades 3-5 scored level 3 or higher in English Language Arts (ELA) and 36% in Math.

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

The 2024 ELA FAST end-of-the-year assessment will increase to 50% from the 2023 ELA FAST end-of-year assessment from 42%, an increase of 8 percentage points.
The 2024 Math FAST end-of-the-year assessment will increase to 50% from the 2023 ELA FAST end-of-year assessment from 36%, an increase of 14 percentage points.
Eighteen percent of Students with Disabilities scored proficient; this score will increase by 23 percentage points.

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

Monitoring the goal of increasing the percentage of proficiency in ELA and Math by ten percentage points involves an intentional approach. Data analysis will play a vital role by routinely tracking student progress and identifying areas of concern. Weekly common planning will provide targeted training for teachers, enabling them to use tailored strategies and interventions. These common plannings will foster collaboration among teachers, aiding in implementing effective teaching methods and strategies. The administration and leadership team will conduct classroom observations to monitor and assess instructional practices, offer feedback, and ensure lessons align with the standards. Adjustments based on data insights and observations will guide ongoing adjustments to teaching techniques.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Latonya Smothers (latonya.smothers@ocps.net)

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.)

SIPPS intervention program is a systematic decoding program that helps developing and struggling readers. Teachers at all grade levels can provide instruction based on student needs, as determined by the SIPPS placement test. Additionally, it makes use of grade-appropriate materials.
SuccessMaker Math is a K-8 online personalized learning system for continuously adaptive intervention and differentiation. The program supplements K-8 core mathematics instruction in an hour every week, with real-time growth and mastery data.

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

The rationale behind using SIPPS lies in its evidence-based approach that addresses diverse learning needs. It offers explicit instruction in crucial areas such as phonological awareness, phonics, and sight word recognition, which are fundamental for reading success. SuccessMaker Math adjusts instruction with every student's response. The program works just like a personal tutor, providing the proper scaffolding, prerequisite skills instruction, or additional practice each student needs right when needed.

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.

We plan to have Professional Development on assessing and the implementation of Exact Path, SuccessMaker, and SIPPs.

Person Responsible: Anne Slee (anne.slee@ocps.net)

By When: The initial placement testing will take place within the first month of school.

Targeted professional development will be planned using data from classroom walkthroughs to plan. Using this data will also affect common planning and what standards and instructional practices will be emphasized.

Person Responsible: Latonya Smothers (latonya.smothers@ocps.net)

By When: On an ongoing weekly basis

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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 analyzing the outcomes of the Early Warning Systems, students absent for ten or more days is an area of concern. Consequently, as a school, we recognize the significant correlation between academic achievement and students' attendance. Student absenteeism is detrimental to learning, academic achievement, and educational outcomes. When looking at grades first through fifth, the following information was taken from the EWS:
1st grade- 47 students were absent ten or more days
2nd grade- 42 students were absent ten or more days
3rd grade- 31 students were absent ten or more days
4th grade- 29 students were absent ten or more days
5th grade- 21 students were absent ten or more days
Based on the data from last year's outcomes, 25% of students had 10 or more absences.

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

The measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is a decrease in students absent for ten or more days from 25% to 15%.

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

The desired outcome of improving the number of students absent for more than ten days is vital to the student's academic achievement. Ongoing data analysis of attendance records can provide insights into areas requiring improvement by the parent. The Attendance Clerk and Social Worker will track individual students' attendance through weekly meetings to help minimize absences. Our goal is to decrease in students absent for ten or more days from 25% to 15%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Latonya Smothers (latonya.smothers@ocps.net)

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.)

By tracking early warning indicators, it is possible to identify when students are beginning to fall off track, providing time to intervene or change supports and alter their trajectory through school and beyond. Using EWS, we can capture the data to drive decisions about targeted support, character development, and intensive interventions until students are back on track.

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

These strategies have been selected based on their alignment to improve school-wide absences. By choosing these strategies, Pine Hill ES aims to create a comprehensive and evidence-based approach to enhance the awareness of the importance of being on time and present in school, ultimately contributing to students' personal growth and long-term academic success.

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.

Hire and retain an attendance clerk who will monitor student attendance and initiate parent content via various methods including letters and phone calls.

Person Responsible: Latonya Smothers (latonya.smothers@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Conduct weekly attendance meetings with attendance clerk and discuss student attendance during teacher data chats.

Person Responsible: Latonya Smothers (latonya.smothers@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

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).

School improvement funding and allocations are reviewed with the School Advisory Council and Pine Hills Elementary School's faculty/staff each year. This review involves a presentation of yearly budget allocations and explaining expenditures to include both general and Title 1 funding. Stakeholders are afforded the opportunity to provide feedback and offer suggestions on proposed expenditures. To meet the needs of Students With Disabilities (ESSA subgroup below 41% index), funding has been allocated to purchase additional personnel to provide students with in-class support, resources, and funding for extended learning opportunities beyond the school day.

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

Based on the 2023 end-of-year STAR data:
Students who did not meet proficiency are as follows:
Kindergarten: 62%
First Grade: 71%
Second Grade: 67%

Based on this data, these students will receive strong foundational skill practice and instruction in developing awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters and additional instruction in decoding words, analyzing word parts, and writing and recognizing words.

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

Based on the 2023 end-of-year F.A.S.T. results:
Students that scored below a level 3 are as follows:
Third Grade: 69%
Fourth Grade: 44%
Fifth Grade: 58%

Based on this data, 3rd-grade students will receive instruction in developing awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. These students will also receive additional instruction in decoding words, analyzing word parts, and writing and recognizing words.

Based on this data, 4th and 5th-grade students will receive instruction in building decoding skills to read complex multisyllabic words.
They will be provided with purposeful fluency-building activities to help reading become an effortless task.
They will be provided with comprehension-building practices to make sense of the text.
Students in 4th and 5th grade will build on world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text
Students in 4th and 5th grade will consistently be provided with opportunities to ask and answer questions
to understand better the text they read
Students in 4th and 5th grade will learn routines for determining the gist of a short section of text.
Students in 4th and 5th grade will monitor their comprehension as they read.

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

In 2023, 62% of our students in Kindergarten did not meet proficiency in ELA as assessed by the STAR Diagnostic. By May 2024, as assessed by the statewide progress monitoring system, 50% of students in Kindergarten will meet proficiency at level 3.

In 2023,71% of our first-grade students did not meet proficiency in ELA as assessed by the end-of-year ELA STAR Diagnostic. By May 2024, as assessed by the statewide progress monitoring system, 50% of students in first grade will meet proficiency at level 3.

In 2023, 67% of our second-grade students did not meet proficiency in ELA as assessed by the end-of-year STAR Diagnostic. By May 2024, as assessed by the statewide progress monitoring system, 50% of students in second grade will meet proficiency at level 3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In 2023, 69% of our students in 3rd grade did not reach proficiency or a level 3 on ELA FSA. By May 2024, as assessed by the statewide FAST, 50% of third-grade students will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of proficiency to 50% and decreasing the number of level 1s from 50 to 25.

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.

Weekly reading walkthroughs will be conducted by administrators.
Monthly data meetings by subject will be conducted to include MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and cadre leadership. The data pieces that will be collected include FAST, K-1 DIBELS, and SIPPS progress monitoring data, along with district-created standard-based unit assessments and early warning system data to monitor response to intervention and CORE instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Smothers, Latonya, latonya.smothers@ocps.net

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?

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 Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9. Providing this intervention to identified students aligns with OCPS' K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan. Having the ability to decode multisyllabic words support B.E.S.T. reading and writing standards.

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?

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.

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

Being a Reader will be used in daily small group lessons in classes for K-3 Tier 1 support to continue practicing skills that explicitly teach and reinforce foundational skills, decoding and encoding, and building fluency through reading selections.

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

-Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; Recommendation 2: Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly; Recommendation 3: Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text)

-OCPS Multisensory Kits (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)

-Exact Path (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; Recommendation 2: Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly; Recommendation 3: Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text)

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 is analyzed and action steps created and set for implementation and monitoring. ELA Coaches will attend IMPACT trainings.	Gray, Stefanie Ann, stefanie.gray@ocps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Pine Hills Elementary website: https://pinehillses.ocps.net/
SAC/MPLC Meeting

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Pine Hills Elementary website: https://pinehillses.ocps.net/
Pine Hills Elementary School will communicate with parents using TalkingPoints and Connect Orange. We will have bi-monthly workshops to help build relationships and to help parents understand their child's progress.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Teachers are invited to district IMPACT meetings to help build an understanding of standards, best practices, and instructional delivery. Teachers attend Common Planning twice weekly to help with Tier 1 instruction, small group instruction, and Interventions.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A