

Volusia County Schools

Pine Trail Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pine Trail Elementary School

300 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pinetrail/pages/default.aspx>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

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 Trail Elementary is a family of educators working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure academic success for students in an environment that fosters social and emotional well-being.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pine Trail Elementary is a family of educators committed to providing a rich, rigorous learning environment that fosters students' social and emotional well-being where all students achieve academic success through the collaborative efforts of faculty, staff, families and community members.

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
Bynum, Charles	Principal	Instructional leader of the school Curriculum implementation Instructional validity Supervisor of site
Whittley, Jody	Assistant Principal	Assistant Instructional Leader Curriculum resources Instructional strategy implementation ESE, Facilities, Discipline Manager of the school
Larkin, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Complete coaching cycles with teachers to improve instruction Research effective instructional strategies and share relevant information with teachers Facilitate Professional Learning Communities Assist with student progress monitoring data and using data to drive instruction
Ingram, Agnes	Other	Assist Assistant Principal with assigned duties while training to become an Assistant Principal
Witter, Doug	Teacher, K-12	Ensure student safety Provide quality instruction to students in Kg
Reamer, Chris	Teacher, K-12	Ensure student safety Provide quality instruction to students in Grade 1
Knorr, April	Teacher, K-12	Ensure student safety Provide quality instruction to students in Grade 2
Wood, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Ensure student safety Provide quality instruction to students in Grade 3 Gifted
Kester, Jason	Teacher, K-12	Ensure student safety Provide quality instruction to students in Grade 4
Reynolds, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	Ensure student safety Provide quality instruction to students in Grade 5 Gifted
Gilbert, Sandra	Teacher, ESE	Ensure student safety Provide quality instruction to support students in grades K-5 who qualify for services under ESE

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.

School Leadership Team provides input monthly. Our SAC is comprised of administrators, teachers, parents, and community members.

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))

Our School Leadership Team meets monthly.

August 2023 SAC meeting will review 2022-2023 SIP and the draft of 2023-2024 SIP. Input will be gathered for revisions if needed.

September 2023 SAC meeting will revise SIP based on SAC and public input.

October 2023 SAC meeting will review final SIP.

January 2023 SIP goal progress will be shared with SAC and Mid-year reflection on SIP will be completed.

February 2023 SIP data and updates will be discussed.

May 2023 SIP progress will be shared with SAC.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	23%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	78%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	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	1	27	24	16	15	21	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	6	6	7	10	3	0	0	0	32
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	21
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	3	4	4	6	6	0	0	0	23

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	2	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	26	16	17	12	16	22	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	9	4	5	3	4	9	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	13	15	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	11	23	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	3	8	14	5	12	0	0	0	56

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	8	1	2	11	10	16	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	26	16	17	12	16	22	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	9	4	5	3	4	9	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	13	15	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	11	23	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	3	8	14	5	12	0	0	0	56

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	8	1	2	11	10	16	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	68	52	53	70	53	56	74		
ELA Learning Gains				72			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			46		
Math Achievement*	73	55	59	74	42	50	81		
Math Learning Gains				65			72		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			67		
Science Achievement*	78	62	54	71	55	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		60	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](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
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	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP	75			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	76			

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	62			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	72			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	56			

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	68			73			78					
SWD	35			41			45				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			38			33				3	
HSP	69			81							2	
MUL	76			72							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	71			76			84				4	
FRL	57			63			71				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	70	72	56	74	65	43	71					
SWD	36	51	42	43	37	30	40					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	90			90								
BLK	31	48	29	34	52	44	18					
HSP	72	67		72	78		69					
MUL	82	77		68	31		80					
PAC												
WHT	73	76	69	79	69	44	77					
FRL	60	65	53	62	58	38	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	74	64	46	81	72	67	70					
SWD	39	50	38	52	81	75	42					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	25		45	50		15					
HSP	72			72								
MUL	83			89								
PAC												
WHT	79	67	61	86	74	69	79					
FRL	66	60	35	74	66	65	53					

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	70%	53%	17%	54%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	57%	11%	58%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	53%	16%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	71%	57%	14%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	55%	25%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	51%	27%

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.

According to PM3 data, our 4th grade ELA data had the lowest performance at 68% proficient. PM2 data yielded fifth grade scoring with the lowest proficiency at 48% and third and fourth grades equally at 57% proficiency.

Contributing Factors: Our 4th grade classes began the year at an average of 27 students per class. It took more than a month to get an additional unit allocated. The principal allowed the fourth grade teachers to develop the class list for the new unit which resulted in pairing of students whose behavioral challenges were exasperated by being in the same class. The first teacher assigned to this unit was a Teacher Apprentice who struggled greatly and had to transition to a standard internship. The classroom

was covered by substitute teachers or split among the other fourth grade teachers when a substitute could not be secured, until a teacher was displaced from another elementary school and placed at our site. In addition, the fourth grade team lacks cohesiveness and are resistant to collaborative planning.

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

Based on the raw proficiency data for PM3 compared to the proficiency levels from FSA in 2022, our overall ELA proficiency decreased by 1%, from 70% proficient to 69% proficient. In contrast, our math proficiency increased 2 percentage points from 74% proficient to 76% proficient.

Contributing factors: The state assessment changed for the 2022-2023 school year. Technical difficulties within the new platform resulted in many students being automatically logged out of the assessment and having to restarted. In addition, we had two novice teachers in third grade and had two teachers who took a leave of absence for a large portion of the school year resulting in gaps in instructional implementation with fidelity and validity of alignment of academic tasks to benchmarks. Our 4th grade classes began the year at an average of 27 students per class. It took more than a month to get an additional unit allocated. The principal allowed the fourth grade teachers to develop the class list for the new unit which resulted in pairing of students whose behavioral challenges were exasperated by being in the same class. The first teacher assigned to this unit was a Teacher Apprentice who struggled greatly and had to transition to a standard internship. The classroom was covered by substitute teachers or split among the other fourth grade teachers when a substitute could not be secured, until a teacher was displaced from another elementary school and placed at our site. In addition, the fourth grade team lacks cohesiveness and are resistant to collaborative planning.

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

Based on the PM3 data, Pine Trail Elementary out performed the state in all subject areas. The closest proficiency performance compared to the state was 4th grade ELA which out performed the state by 10 percentage points. In comparison, third grade outperformed the state by 19 percentage points, and 5th grade outperformed the state by 16 percentage points.

Contributing Factors: Our 4th grade classes began the year at an average of 27 students per class. It took more than a month to get an additional unit allocated. The principal allowed the fourth grade teachers to develop the class list for the new unit which resulted in pairing of students whose behavioral challenges were exasperated by being in the same class. The first teacher assigned to this unit was a Teacher Apprentice who struggled greatly and had to transition to a standard internship. The classroom was covered by substitute teachers or split among the other fourth grade teachers when a substitute could not be secured, until a teacher was displaced from another elementary school and placed at our site. In addition, the fourth grade team lacks cohesiveness and are resistant to collaborative planning.

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

Based on PM3 data, our 5th grade math data had the greatest increase in improvement, from 72% proficient to 80% proficient, outscoring the district and the state by 25 percentage points.

New Actions: Our fifth grade team embraced collaborative planning during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Based on our EWS data, attendance and out of school suspensions are our greatest areas of concern.

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

Based on our reflection and answers to questions 1-5, the systems that need the most attention at our site are collaborative planning within all grade levels and PBIS to decrease referrals and out of school suspensions.

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 Collaborative Planning**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.

As part of the comprehensive needs assessment, we identified that the grade level team yielding the most growth correlated to the grade level team where collaborative planning was most embraced. The team understood the importance of working together to align instruction and ensure appropriate rigor of teacher created tasks resulting in improved student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

After administration of PM1 and PM2, 85% of students will demonstrate growth consistent with our cohort schools of like demographics. By April 2024, 85% of teachers will be providing students with Benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced in walk-throughs. By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 support will decrease by 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Student data will be disaggregated after PM1 and PM2 and compared to our cohort schools with like demographics. We will implement collaborative planning template which will be submitted to the administrative team at the culmination of each collaborative planning session. The administrative team and academic coach will review planning data during administrative meetings and look for implementation during classroom visits/walk-throughs. Data will be reviewed following assessments and compared against planning initiatives to determine impact on student outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.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.)

Providing Professional Development: By providing collaborative planning bi-weekly through professional learning communities, facilitated by school-based Academic Coach and Administrators, designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, and build efficacy among staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative work groups are particularly fruitful sites for teachers to learn and improve as evidenced by Organizing Schools for Collaborative Learning: School Leadership and Teachers' Engagement in Collaboration, Kemperpatrick, Susan (June 21, 2022). Learning Policy Institute, v58 i4 p638-673. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=collaborative+planning&pg=3&id=EJ1350279>.

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.

Create a master schedule that allows grade level specific collaborative planning to occur bi-weekly with administrators and academic coach support evidenced by a master schedule product resulting in designated, protected time for collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Jody Whittley (jlwhittl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 11, 2023

Create and implement a collaborative planning template including before, during, and after planning expectations which will be submitted to the administrative team at the culmination of each collaborative planning session evidenced by completed template samples resulting in teachers providing tasks that are aligned to the rigor of the Benchmark.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Created by first collaborative planning session on August 31, 2023 Implemented with fidelity by December 2023

Academic Coach will provide content support based on walkthrough data evidenced by a tiered coaching support plan developed reflective to walkthrough trends resulting in improvement in walkthrough data of identified teachers over time.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. 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.

Based on review of needs assessment discipline data, Pine Trail Elementary student behaviors, such as physical aggression, increased during the 22-23 SY despite it being the first year of implementation of a school-wide PBIS system. This data trend is indicated by increases in incidents of physical aggression resulting in increases in office discipline referrals for hitting and striking actions. There was a total of 531 discipline events up from 470 discipline events in the 21-22 SY. Discipline data for the 22-23 SY showed 115 incidents of hitting/striking, and 62 incidents of hitting/striking an employee for a total of 177 incidents of physical aggression. Compared to the 21-22 SY data, there were 125 incidents of hitting/striking and 17 incidents of hitting/striking an employee for a total of 145 incidents of physical aggression. While the incidents of hitting/striking peers decreased by 10, the incidents of hitting/striking an employee significantly increased by 40 incidents. A deeper dive into this data revealed that this data is skewed by having two low-incident programs at our site (EBD and ASD) as majority of the hitting/striking employee occurred in these settings.

Physical aggression incidents resulted in 172 out of school suspensions which is 32% of the overall discipline actions. Comparatively, the discipline data from the 21-22 SY showed 42 out of 484 (9%) of discipline incidents resulted in OSS. A deeper dive into this data reflected majority of the OSS included in the 23% increase derived from an employee injury resulting from physical aggression demonstrated by students serviced in our ESE Separate Class units, particularly ASD.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal for the 23-24 SY will be to revise and refine our PBIS system to increase effectiveness. We will utilize the PBIS Benchmarks of Quality Self-Assessment tool data, walkthrough data, and discipline data to progress monitor fidelity of implementation with a focus on reducing discipline referrals resulting in out-of-school suspensions of all student subgroups by 25% by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in the fall, spring and year's end through the Benchmarks of Quality Self-Assessment tool, discipline referral data, and walkthroughs by school-based administrators and academic coach. This data will be reviewed during school level PBIS team meetings, faculty meetings and stock-take meetings. PLCs will include development to increase core instruction in behavior for all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jody Whittley (jlwhittl@volusia.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.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a multi-disciplinary approach through a district-wide MTSS framework. The outcomes will be measured and monitored:

- Discipline referrals will be monitored by the school-based administrators, MTSS team and by the school-based PBIS PLC monthly
- Fidelity checklists will be monitored by the MTSS and PBIS teams for progress monitoring and planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A growing evidence base has found that PBIS has been particularly effective at reducing both in and out-of-school suspensions as evidenced by Using Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports to Reduce School Suspensions, Beahm, Lydia; Gage, Nicholas; MacSuga-Gage, Ashley; Kaplan, Rachel; Lee, Ahhyun (December 2020). Beyond Behavior, v29 i3 p132-140. retrieved from <https://eric.edu.gov/?q=pbis&ft=on&id=EJ1273750>

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.

During the 2023-2024 school year, the PBIS team will monitor system refining data and outcome data for the PBIS system.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

Monthly monitoring of discipline data will be reviewed with the PBIS team and disseminated to their respective grade levels.

Person Responsible: Jody Whittley (jlwhittl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

Professional Learning through ERPLs on effective PBIS systems and structures

Person Responsible: Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: ERPL December 6, 2023 ERPL March 13, 2024

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).

Based on review of our data generated from Progress Monitoring 3 (PM3) administered in May of 2023, Pine Trail subgroups, African American (AA) and Students With Disabilities (SWD), did not yield percent proficient at or above 41% as required for the federal index floor. Respectively, these subgroups yielded scores of 37% and 40% on this assessment. Targeted progress monitoring will be conducted for these ESSA subgroups through bi-weekly PLC sessions which do not require specialized funding.

Pine Trail's Early Release Professional Learning (ERPL) will be alternated between our School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals of collaborative planning and PBIS. During the Collaborative Planning PD, teams will research, discuss, and model effective strategies for impactful collaborative planning. Teams will continue this process during PBIS PD, with an emphasis on building solid relationships with students and families, effective classroom management strategies and continued progress monitoring of school-wide discipline data to identify

and address trends.

Pine Trail Elementary has an allocation of 138 hours at \$25 an hour for a total of \$3,450 earmarked for math collaboration. These funds will be utilized to provide additional, after-school collaborative planning time for teachers in grades 3-5. These sessions will incorporate identifying the unique needs of our underperforming ESSA subgroups and planning to meet these needs with fidelity. Pine Trail is requesting matching funds for school improvement through the School Advisory Committee (SAC) to mimic this process for ELA.

Pine Trail Elementary is requesting school improvement funding from SAC in the amount of \$400 to match a donation from PTA to provide reinforcers identified on our PBIS incentive menu. Our intent is to increase student buy-in to our PBIS system to improve student response to positive interventions. Last year was our first year as a PBIS school and the response to intervention did not produce the improvement in student behavior and reduction in out of school suspensions we expected.

Pine Trail Elementary received a district ESE allocation of \$2,109, of which \$125 dollars were provided to each of 12 teachers of ESE to utilize for supplemental instructional materials to increase acquisition of academic skills of students in our SWD subgroup. The remaining \$609 is providing items to assist with managing behaviors in our low incident programs such as fluorescent light covers to adjust the sensory responses from our students in our Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) units. A deep dive into our discipline data revealed that a high percentage of our OSS incidents were in response to hitting/striking of peers and employees in our ASD self-contained units.