Pembroke Pines Charter Elementary School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pembroke Pines Charter Elementary School

10801 PEMBROKE ROAD, Pembroke Pines, FL 33025

pinescharter.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.

It is our mission to prepare students to succeed in a global society by providing a personalized and rigorous curriculum through excellence in teaching.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision, as a community, is to cultivate character and foster lifelong learning through a challenging educational experience in a safe environment.

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
Chance, Sean	Principal	The PPCES leadership team consisting of administration, guidance, and curriculum provides direction, instructions, and guidance to teachers and staff. The team meets regularly to develop strategies to reach goals, identify professional development needs, meet with teachers to discuss areas of concern, and provide guidance and results-oriented solutions. The leadership team spends time working on matters of long-term importance, including common policies, common direction, and organizational development and improvement initiatives that lead to school improvement and student academic achievement. Channale Augustin, Michael Castellano, and Sean Chance are the principals of Pembroke Pines Charter Elementary School for the East Campus, West Campus, and Central Campus respectively. They meet regularly with the assistant principals, curriculum specialists, guidance counselors, teachers, and staff to discuss curriculum and instruction, day-to-day operations, safety, and policies to improve the school. The principals review student and teacher data, perform walk-throughs and observations, conduct meetings with stakeholders, and communicate with the Parent Advisory Board, City of Pembroke Pines personnel, and the City Commission, which serves as the school's governing board. The principals frequently meet with parent groups and attend school and community functions. They communicate with stakeholders via global email notices, faculty meetings, parent nights, workshops, parent link, and morning announcements which provide information on school activities and functions. Additionally, the principals are responsible for the allocation and disbursement of budgetary finances to ensure all students receive an equitable education and that a clean, safe, and orderly environment is accessible to all stakeholders. Samantha Grandson, Melissa Fernandez, and Crystal Shelton, are the assistant principals of the West Campus, East Campus, and Central Campus respectively. The assistant principals meet regularly with teachers, staff and students to discuss the day-to-day operations, school safety procedures, student data, and curriculum and instruction. They serve as the school liaison for the Parent Teacher Association and provide support in all fundraising activities. The assistant principals are the main contact for disciplinary issues in the school and also perform walk-throughs and observations. In addition, assistant principals meet with staff and parents about individual student academic and/or behavioral needs. Mercedes Lambert, Sigried Palau, and Kimberly Lookretis, and are the guidance counselors for the West Campus, East Campus and Central Campus respectively. Each counselor meets with teachers, staff, and students in the areas of academic performance and personal social issues. They work with small groups of students, individual students, and classes to implement a comprehensive annual guidance plan. The counselors oversee the Character Education program, Anti-bullying program, the Social Emotional Learning curriculum, and the development of social skills. In

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		addition, they serve as Testing Coordinator, Interventionist Team Leader, Section 504 Liaison, Child Abuse Designee, and Homeless Education Liaison for their respective campuses. To ensure system alignment they also oversee the data management system that monitors students' progress in the MTSS/RTI process.
Castellano, Michael	Principal	
Channale, Augustin	Principal	
Wolfe, Jill	Instructional Coach	Dina Logan, Kimberlee Farinella, and Jill Wolfe are the curriculum specialists for the Central Campus, West Campus, and East Campus respectively. The curriculum specialists disaggregate and analyze the school's data and use the information to select instructional approaches, identify research-based materials, and spearhead school-wide initiatives. Along with all stakeholders, they develop a school improvement plan. They conduct professional development trainings for teachers and conference with teachers to provide instructional feedback when needed. The curriculum specialists serve as the accreditation team for the system; meet regularly to align the system's policies, procedures, and curriculum; and design and deliver parent workshops focusing on increasing student achievement. As the in-service facilitators, the curriculum specialists meet with Professional Learning Community (PLC) coordinators on a regular basis in order to facilitate ongoing professional development for all teachers. In addition, the curriculum specialists mentor beginning teachers, model effective lessons in the classrooms, assist in parent conferences, and facilitate data chats. They are also the school liaisons for all online platforms such as FOCUS, Canvas, i-Ready, Benchmark Universe, Planbook, Savvas Math, and HMH Science.

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.

An integral continuous improvement process that is focused on learners' experiences and needs is the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Annually, the leadership team collaborates with instructional support teams to guide campus School Improvement Plans (SIP). School Improvement Plans are intended to be a primary artifact to review data, set goals, create an action plan, and monitor progress. This living document guides the leadership team in decision making and in supporting improvement system wide as evidenced in our annual SIP submissions.

School Improvement Plans (SIP) are shared with all stakeholders; teachers, parents, students, and staff. In order to promote more engagement in the SIP plan creation, school leaders have expanded ways to reach the target audiences. Through student surveys, PTA and School Advisory board feedback, the

leadership team amends the SIP as needed to reflect improvement initiatives across the campus.

SIP plans are presented annually to the School Advisory Boards for public Q and A and final approval. Plans and School Advisory Notes are found on the school website.

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))

The PPCS 5051 SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards/ Systemically, the School Advisory Board, approves SIP plan annually after the system administrators have provided input and feedback to campus leadership teams. The 15 member Charter Elementary / Middle School Advisory Board meets monthly to review school procedure and policies and make recommendations that will advance, encourage, and enhance the education of the City's charter elementary and middle school students. Guidance, ESE< Curriculum, Team leaders and site based administrators provide input and participate in ongoing progress monitoring of school wide and ESSA subgroup and ESE goals. PLC goals are created based upon schoolwide student achievement. Each department monitors progress towards their schoolwide literacy and content area PLC goals. Midyear i-ready Reading and Math diagnostics and FAST PM 2 progress monitoring contribute to ongoing instructional planning and adjustments to timelines and action steps included in the SIP may be made at this time. All tested area content teachers and ESE support facilitators participate in formal data chats three times a year with administration, guidance, and curriculum. ESE Support Facilitators monitor SWD student achievement based on IEP indicators. Administrators conduct evaluative classroom observations that will provide additional data points to support SIP implementation in the classroom. Continuous improvement is the annual goal across the system.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	90%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History	2021-22: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: 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	70	77	51	76	70	64	0	0	0	408
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	6	4	14	1	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	1	5	0	3	8	6	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	24	17	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	28	27	0	0	0	79
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	
	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	0	8	7	13	0	0	0	28

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	3	4	6	1	1	0	0	0	15
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	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	13	9	3	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	26	11	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	38	45	0	0	0	106
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	13	9	3	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	26	11	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	38	45	0	0	0	106
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	80	58	56	80	59	57
ELA Learning Gains	77	66	61	68	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64	56	52	53	54	53
Math Achievement*	75	59	60	84	65	63
Math Learning Gains	77	72	64	71	66	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62	63	55	57	53	51
Science Achievement*	68	45	51	66	46	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	46			74		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	549
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	51			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	62			
HSP	70			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	62			

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)

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	77	64	75	77	62	68					46
SWD	49	64	57	48	63	51	34					40
ELL	71	73	64	72	70	44	55					46
AMI												
ASN	86	77	60	93	87		85					46
BLK	73	72	48	62	69	57	54					
HSP	81	77	69	75	76	63	72					43
MUL	80	83		79	96		75					
PAC												
WHT	81	90	79	84	85		71					
FRL	72	74	60	64	72	58	63					35

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	78	61	52	61	38	21	63					73
SWD	48	46	45	43	22	16	27					
ELL	69	69	59	53	20	0	43					73
AMI												
ASN	89	70		84	69		90					45
BLK	76	56	52	49	39	13	51					
HSP	75	58	49	60	32	24	62					79
MUL	76			65								
PAC												
WHT	83	81		75	42		77					
FRL	70	55	44	47	30	7	48					83

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	80	68	53	84	71	57	66					74
SWD	47	41	37	58	60	48	32					
ELL	70	73	68	75	71	57	45					74

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	95	83		98	83		81					80
BLK	76	66	49	75	60	42	59					
HSP	79	67	53	85	73	64	66					71
MUL	88	63		83	67							
PAC												
WHT	85	68	61	87	77	56	70					
FRL	73	67	52	75	63	52	55					74

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	78%	56%	22%	54%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	61%	16%	58%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	50%	23%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	62%	19%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	65%	17%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	55%	24%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	46%	24%	51%	19%

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 that showed the lowest performance was our 5th grade Science FSSA which was 70% proficiency. However, that far exceeded the district level performance which was 46% proficiency as well as the state which was 51% proficiency. This means we were performing at 24% above and 19% above respectively. We did show a 2% increase in proficiency from the 22-23 school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA for grades 3-5. In 2022, students took the FSA. 3rd graders scored a proficiency level of 74% in our system. In 2023, 3rd graders took the FAST assessment in which 73% of the system was proficient. In 2022, 4th grade was 80% proficient on the ELA FSA compared to 77% proficiency on the ELA FAST assessment in 2023. Lastly, 85% of 5th graders were proficient on the ELA FSA in 2022 compared to 78% of fifth graders scoring proficiency on the 2023 ELA FAST. It is important to note that students in 2022 were administered the FSA Assessment which assessed the Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS). In 2023, new state standards were implemented in grades 3-5 resulting in a new standardized assessment called the FAST. Furthermore, students were introduced to a digital platform whilst taking this new assessment.

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.

When compared to the state average, our system far exceeds in performance in every area.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement from the prior year was Math for grades 3-5. In 2022, 3rd grade scored 77% proficiency on the FSA versus 81% proficiency on the FAST in 2023. In 2022, 4th grade scored 77% proficiency on the FSA versus 82% proficiency on the Math FAST in 2023. In 2022, 5th grade scored 69% proficiency on the Math FSA versus 79% proficiency on the Math FAST in 2023. Post pandemic math proficiency created a marked decline. As a school math strategies, interventions and professional development became a school wide focus to close the achievement gaps created by the pandemic. The systematic use of said interventions and strategies contributed to the increase in math proficiency.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, one potential concern would be the number of students that are missing more than 10% of the school days.

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

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 ELA

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

The decision to prioritize ELA proficiency, especially reading comprehension, stems from multiple data points:
Comparative Performance: As indicated, our school's performance in reading comprehension consistently exceeds the district averages. However, although our scores might appear favorable in isolation, the comparative data from previous years, prior to the pandemic, indicates a gap that needs to be addressed.

Additionally, reading comprehension is not just an ELA skill but a foundational capability that affects students' performance across all subjects. A solid grasp of reading comprehension ensures that students can understand, analyze, and apply information from diverse sources, fostering overall academic success.

Moreover, The State of Florida has recently emphasized the Science of Reading initiative, advocating for evidence-based reading instruction. This initiative underscores the importance of developing strong reading skills from the early grades, aligning with current educational research on the significance of reading in cognitive development.

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

By June 2024 students in 3rd-5th grade will increase proficiency in ELA by 3%.
3rd grade 73% to 76%.
4th grade 77% to 80%.
5th grade 78% to 81%.

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

PM data from district assessments platforms will be used to ensure that students are mastering grade level benchmarks. Systematic data chats with school leaders, teachers and support staff will identify students who require intervention. Additionally, data analysis and progress monitoring will be implemented weekly during grade level PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sean Chance (schance@pinescharter.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.)

The following programs will be implemented for interventions: Wilson Fundations, Reading Horizons, Leveled Literacy Intervention

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

Curriculum specialists utilized the Florida Center for Reading Research Reading Program Repository to identify research based intervention programs.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

The Early Warning Systems (EWS) data shows an increase in the number of students scoring a level 1 on the statewide ELA assessments. There is also a significant increase in the number of students missing 10% or more days of school.

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

By May 2024, 79% of our 3rd-5th grade students will score at a level 3 or above on the FAST ELA PM 3 Assessment as evidences by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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

This area of focus will be monitored quarterly through pm 1 and 2 data analysis as well as data chats with teachers and support staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sean Chance (schance@pinescharter.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.)

All school districts are required to have an early warning system (EWS) that identifies students who need additional support to improve academic performance and stay engaged in school pursuant to Section 1001.42(18), F.S.

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

Sustaining a positive culture and environment conducive to learning is a part of our system's belief system. A positive school culture and a supportive learning environment impacts student achievement. The early warning
system identifies students with poor academic performance, behavior concerns, and attendance issues. Close monitoring of the data allows school leaders to continue to readjust and monitor the plans and policies to strengthen student-teacher relations through mentorship and other health services.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

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

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?

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?

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

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.

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))

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))

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))

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

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

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

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

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No