

St. Johns County School District

Pine Island Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pine Island Academy

805 PINE ISLAND RD, St Augustine, FL 32095

<http://www-pia.stjohns.k12.fl.us>

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.

Pine Island Academy - Discovering Strengths and Pursuing Dreams

Provide the school's vision statement.

One Pod, Making WAVES - Fins UP...

Focused on building an
Inspiring,
Nurturing,
Safe environment -

Unlocking, Unlimited
Potential

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
Riedl, Amanda	Principal	To provide support to and for the schools' mission and vision.
Naylor, Rachel	Assistant Principal	To provide support to and for the schools' mission and vision.
Lippo, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	To provide support to and for the schools' mission and vision.
Cortes, Ruth	Assistant Principal	To provide support to and for the schools' mission and vision.
Shely, Denise	Instructional Coach	To support administration in fulfilling the school's mission and vision statement through literacy.
Jackson, Michelle	Math Coach	To support administration in fulfilling the school's mission and vision statement through mathematics.
Anderson, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	Physical Education Teacher
Cally, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	MS ELA Teacher
Solis, Cullen	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade teacher
Harlow, Cali	Teacher, K-12	MS Civics teachers
Otzenberger, Alana	Teacher, K-12	1st grade Teacher
Stuckey, Kim	Teacher, K-12	5th grade teacher
Wilkey, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	SAC Leader & 3rd grade teacher

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 Leadership team works through high leverage team process to analyze the EOY data. Using the data and the learning growth of students throughout the year, the team identifies the goals that were met and the goals that will continue to be a focus for Pine Island. PIA met and exceeded 3 out of the 4 goals of the 22 - 23 school year, increased the number of students scoring proficiency in math fluency from PM1 to PM 3, reduced the number of students scoring Level 1 from PM1 to PM3, and empowering students to become actively engaged in their own learning. In analyzing the data, our goals will be to

implement Tier I instruction with fidelity, using a school-wide prevention structure to ensure more students are meeting proficiency as measured by the state assessment progress monitoring benchmarks. Grade Levels and content areas are working to develop instructional plans that identify the best instructional practices that will be implemented with fidelity in Tier I and a plan of action for students that will need additional learning time on specific standards and the teacher that will be responsible for specific groups of students within each quadrant. Using the Progress Monitoring assessments to monitor the progress will give us evidence to look at specific cohorts of students.

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))

Goals will be monitored during each PM benchmarking period. In addition, grade levels will set short term goals that will be written using CFA/CSA data and respond immediately to students that need additional support to meet learning proficiency. If the percentage of students scoring proficiency exceeds the EOY goal on PM2, goals will be adjusted accordingly.

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	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	5%
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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	26	17	14	11	18	9	24	25	13	157	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	17	13	45	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	14	10	10	10	53	
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		

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	8	9	11	10	13	9	13	13	0	86	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	13	8	6	0	36	
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	3	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	33	

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	1	5	4	5	2	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	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	8	9	11	10	13	9	13	13	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	13	8	6	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	3	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	1	5	4	5	2	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	74	72	53	80	75	55			
ELA Learning Gains				64					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55					
Math Achievement*	79	78	55	83	45	42			
Math Learning Gains				67					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61					
Science Achievement*	79	74	52	74	81	54			
Social Studies Achievement*	58	79	68	93	71	59			
Middle School Acceleration	79	71	70		56	51			
Graduation Rate		82	74		73	50			
College and Career Acceleration		32	53		89	70			
ELP Progress		70	55		70	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	577
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK				
HSP	78			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	74			

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	43			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK				
HSP	72			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	71			

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	74			79			79	58	79			
SWD	37			40			33				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	88			91			96		89		4	
BLK												
HSP	76			70			73		81		5	
MUL	84			82			80		90		5	
PAC												
WHT	72			80			78		75		5	
FRL	71			75			78		70		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	80	64	55	83	67	61	74	93				
SWD	38	50	38	43	52	46	39	40				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	79	69		95	89		90	100				
BLK												
HSP	79	67	56	83	61	53	76	100				
MUL	81	70		68	57							
PAC												
WHT	81	63	56	84	68	64	73	91				
FRL	78	70		75	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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	76%	71%	5%	54%	22%
07	2023 - Spring	70%	69%	1%	47%	23%
08	2023 - Spring	75%	69%	6%	47%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	76%	1%	58%	19%
06	2023 - Spring	74%	70%	4%	47%	27%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	72%	5%	50%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	80%	81%	-1%	54%	26%
07	2023 - Spring	66%	66%	0%	48%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	78%	-1%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	87%	79%	8%	61%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	89%	81%	8%	55%	34%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	74%	6%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	83%	71%	12%	44%	39%
05	2023 - Spring	76%	70%	6%	51%	25%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	78%	17%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	67%	33%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	85%	-25%	66%	-6%

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.

SWD showed the greatest need of improvement in both ELA and Math.

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

SWD demonstrate the greatest need for improvement in the area of ELA with only 41% scoring Level 3 or above. This was not a decline as only 38% of SWD scored at proficiency during the 21 - 22 school year. The factors that continue to impact the low performance of our SWD is the lack of collaboration and fidelity between ESE teachers and general education 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.

SWD continue to be the area of opportunity for PIA. Whether in Social Studies or other content areas, the SWD are not meet proficiency at the rate the general education students are meeting proficiency. As a new school we work in an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry.

Through the collective inquiry process we build shared knowledge by utilizing new methods of teacher and examining best practices. Being intentional in planning and how the instructional strategies will meet the specific needs of students as we develop instructional plans ensures fidelity of practices. Lack of collaborative structures between ESE teachers and general education teachers was a contributing factor in the low performance we continue to observe at PIA. Collaborative structures that provide on-going dialogue between ESE and Gen Ed teachers will be critical in ensuring our SWD show increased proficiency across all content areas.

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

Math proficiency showed the greatest growth during the 22 - 23 school year. Number Talks was implemented in grades K - 5 and MS math classrooms at least 3X a week. On-going cycles of PD through modeling, reflection, and observing was created to provide teachers support throughout the year in implementing Number Talks with fidelity. We observed an increase in fluency, number sense, and math talk throughout classrooms and on assessments.

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

Student absences are high throughout the school. We will work to provide students with a mentor to help decrease student absences.

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

1. Ensure fidelity for Tier I instruction.
2. Ensure collaboration between ESE teachers and grade level teachers.
3. Increase teacher efficacy by sharing in collective inquiry and building a shared knowledge by engaging in new instructional practices and examining best instructional practices.

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 Professional Learning Communities

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.

Collaborative Teams will work together to identify specific instructional strategies are included in Tier I instruction while identifying a plan of action for students that do not access the learning during the allotted amount of time. Creating a re-teach plan simultaneously allows for teams to respond immediately to any student that is not meeting proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students scoring at Level 2 or Level 1 will decrease from 25% (Spring 23) to 15% (Spring 24) on the ELA Fast assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Collaborative teams will meet immediately following CSA's to regroup students based on the plan of action and what students need following the assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Shely (denise.shely@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Collaborative teams will respond to students by using in a data analysis spreadsheet that have the interventions already identified to meet student's specific needs during the universal reteach time. This ensures students throughout a grade level or content area equal access to learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By having a plan identified with specific interventions prior to data analysis meeting ensures teams are responding immediately to the learning needs.

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.

Teams will develop a re-teach plan of action with identified strategies of each group of learners as they develop units of study.

Person Responsible: Denise Shely (denise.shely@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: When planning instructional calendars at the beginning of each quarter.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

75% of students scored Level 3 or above on Spring 2023 PM3 & 86%(K - 2) scored 40% or higher in Reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

85% of students in grade 3rd - 8th grade will perform at a Level 3 or higher on PM 3 in EL A and 91% of students in grades K - 2 will score at 40% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

Using entry/exit or pre/post assessment data, students will be grouped in way that facilitate practicing a skill or process during Tier I instruction to deepen their understanding of new learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Teams will determine how they will monitor new learning, exit tickets, quick check, readiness assessments. Using those checks for understanding as Tier I instruction is delivered, students will be given further practice to deepen their understanding of new learning or placed in a re-teach to learn in a different way.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Agreeing on Tier I instructional strategies and using with fidelity ensures all students have equal opportunities to new learning and are met with additional strategies if proficiency is not met.

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.

Collaborative teams will use data (exit tickets/pre/post assessments) to group students according to the skill/strategy/process they need to practice or receive additional small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Michelle Jackson (michelle.jackson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Following each CFA, check for understanding and determined by the teams instructional timeline.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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 SWD subgroup will score at 60% proficiency in both Reading and Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All students in the SWD sub-group will increase by two (2) levels measured by STAR or FAST assessment from PM 1 to PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

ESE Teachers will meet bi-weekly with grade level teachers to lesson plan, monitor student learning, and align strategies that have been agreed upon to ensure fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachel Naylor (rachel.naylor@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

During Data Dialogue meetings, ESE teachers and grade levels will identify specific high-yield strategies that have shown the greatest impact on specific learning deficiencies and agree upon which of these strategies will be used for SWD. To ensure fidelity, strategies will be modeled for all teachers to gain greater capacity in identifying misconceptions and how to provide specific instruction.

Working together to identify a common understanding of what the learning looks like within a standard and the common misconceptions/mistakes for each of our grade level essentials. This ensures students throughout a grade level or content area have equal access to learning, regardless of a label or not.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Working together to identify a common understanding of what the learning looks like within a standard and the common misconceptions/mistakes for each of our grade level essentials. This ensures students throughout a grade level or content area equal access to learning.

Determining and agreeing upon the level of rigor for student learning outcomes ensures fidelity throughout the learning environment and provides equal learning opportunities for all students.

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.

1. ESE Teachers will provide support in the classrooms on grade level learning.
2. ESE Teachers and grade level teachers will work collaboratively to develop plans that include the agreed upon strategies for SWD to use during support facilitation and pull-out support.
3. Grade level teachers will ensure that no new learning happens during small group ESE pull out time.
4. ESE and Grade level teachers will meet bi-weekly to monitor student learning and make data driven decisions regarding strategies used that are showing learning gains.

Person Responsible: Rachel Naylor (rachel.naylor@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: On-going, will be measured at each benchmark period by STAR/FAST

#4. 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.

Pine Island will build a culture to empower students to be passionate about their own learning and foster a student-managed learning environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of classrooms will develop relationships that celebrate the whole child as a PBIS school using Capturing Kids Hearts strategies with a focus on heart first.

Monitoring:

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

All classrooms will build social contract to help students recognize and use their values and commitments to facilitate a healthy, responsible learning classroom that becomes student managed. All classrooms will begin each day or class with sharing good news and goals to embrace relationships as the foundation to all learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ruth Cortes (ruth.cortes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

PBIS has shown to have a positive impact on the learning environment using educational and systems change methods (environmental redesign) to enhance quality of life and minimize problem behavior. Developing a culture that is built on strong values and beliefs and teaching all stakeholders how we respect these values, provides ways to recognize, reward, and reinforce what matters most in the learning environment.

At PIA, we will embrace the values and methods of Capturing Kids Hearts, as we know you must capture a student's heart before you will capture a student's mind. Teacher, Modeling, and Practicing daily strategies to build a student-managed classrooms gives students a sense of ownership, pride, and builds competent learners that believe they are capable of success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building a climate and culture that shows respect, as a whole, for academic performance, character development, and the commitment to student learning are key contributors in increased attendance, improved academic performance and behavior, higher teacher retention rates, and a boost in overall school spirit.

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.

1. Students were chosen to be WAVE leaders in our 8th grade class and have served as Ambassadors for our 6th grade students, new students, and providing mentoring support to our K - 5 students.
2. Each classroom in K - 5 will recognize five (5) students quarterly that show excellence in academics, character development, PIA WAVE, and perseverance.
3. Middle School students will be recognized in the classroom, CAFE, and throughout the halls with Dolphin points. Each week (5) MS students are drawn for VIP passes with special privileges.
4. (20) Middle School students will be recognized monthly by their teachers as Dolphin of the Month. These students exhibit the monthly pillar of character and will receive a special luncheon to celebrate their great character.
5. Dolphin Dollars will be given to students for going above and beyond and recognized on Friday with WAVE trophy.

Person Responsible: Ruth Cortes (ruth.cortes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly/Quarterly