Pinewood Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pinewood Elementary School

3757 OLD DIXIE HWY, Mims, FL 32754

http://www.pinewood.brevard.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.

All staff, students and parents work together to create P.R.I.D.E in our community. (Positivity, Responsibility, Integrity, Determination and Excellence)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students today and building leaders of tomorrow where all belong, all learn and all have pride in their community.

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
Robinson, Mitzi	Principal	The Principal is the instructional leader and leads the team through all aspects of school improvement, data analysis and collaborative decision making. She leads the Pinewood Leadership Team which meets every Monday morning to discuss upcoming school events, PBIS, data and MTSS. The team coordinates individual team member calendars, including MTSS/ IPST meeting dates and times. Upcoming data team meeting agendas are also created during these meetings. These meetings are also used to problem solve issues that arise within the school. The results of the meetings are then shared with appropriate parties.
Smith, Amber	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports all aspects of school improvement. She will attend all leadership team meetings and will coordinate the facilitation of the MTSS process. She will guide our staff in identifying and monitoring students in the MTSS processes, ensure interventions are done with fidelity and that documentation meet state expectations. She will deliver instructional guidance by providing researched based curriculum materials, analyze data while guiding staff to understand and adapt instruction, observing and providing feedback to improve current teacher practices. Mrs. Smith is also our testing coordinator which involves planning and scheduling for all testing protocols to be followed with fidelity along with faculty and staff being given the proper training. She communicates with parents to resolve any disciplinary measures and coordinates with our guidance counselor the social/emotional needs of students.
Vaughan, Kathleen	Reading Coach	Ms. Vaughan is the Literacy Coach and the Parent and Family Involvement Coordinator. She mentors new teachers by modeling lessons, provides guidance on lesson planning, and peer observations. She provides English Language Arts professional development to staff which addresses the needs of all learners. During data team meetings, Ms. Vaughan helps lead data analysis and drive instructional delivery to meeting the rigor of the standards. She helps to monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions and instructs teachers how to carry out researched based interventions. Last, she utilizes the coaching cycle to observe and provide feedback to teachers to consistently improve their practices.
Coulson, Liana	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Coulson is our MTSS coordinator and Title I coordinator. She leads MTSS development, supports data collection, and specialized subgroup populations development, including the lowest quartile students. She provides student intervention and, also, serves as a mentor to teachers. She oversees the Title 1 Framework.
Nason, Jennifer	School Counselor	Mrs. Nason provides MTSS assistance to teachers, shares data and critical information regarding student performance and behavior, and ESE supports to faculty and students. Mrs. Nason facilitates the implementation of school wide SEL curriculum and collaborates with our school's social worker to provide counseling to some of our most vulnerable students. Mrs. Nason provides counseling to groups based on teacher referrals and checks in/out

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		with many students. She collaborates with schools in the feeder chain pattern to assure continuity of supports for students as they transition to middle school. Lastly, she oversees all of our ESOL compliance.
Charron, Chris	Other	Mr. Charron is our Technology Specialist and works with our teachers and staff to ensure that our students have the technology they need. He is also on our SAC, and as such, helps to communicate with our stakeholders on our goals and needs.

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.

Administration presented end of year iReady and FAST data to teachers. A reflection was done regarding what went well, improvements that could be made and materials that could enhance instruction for the following year. This same data was presented to stakeholders through various media platforms and asked for the same feedback.

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 leadership team will conduct walkthroughs regularly to ensure effective tier I instruction is in place and teachers are implementing interventions plans with fidelity. Data team meetings will be held weekly to track student progress towards grade level standards, assist teachers in differentiating instruction and adjusting intervention groups. The leadership team will come together after each FAST testing period to revise this plan as needed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	12%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	97%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 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	14	23	14	15	9	4	13	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	6	6	2	6	0	0	27
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	13	12	14	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	0	0	18
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	1	2	1	4	5	6	7	0	0	26

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	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	5

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	7	24	19	19	8	18	10	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	1	6	5	4	1	1	5	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	10	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	8	12	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	23	19	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	6

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	7	24	19	19	8	18	10	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	1	6	5	4	1	1	5	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	10	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	8	12	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	23	19	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	6

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61			65			67		
ELA Learning Gains	63			52			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46			39			56		
Math Achievement*	67			65			67		
Math Learning Gains	71			54			65		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49			40			56		
Science Achievement*	61			55			76		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	25	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	54			

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	61	63	46	67	71	49	61					
SWD	17	30	11	29	40	26	23					

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
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	63	54		81	77							
PAC												
WHT	61	65	47	65	70	47	63					
FRL	55	53	38	59	67	46	58					

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	65	52	39	65	54	40	55					
SWD	38	46	42	35	36	31	21					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	72	75		61	58							
PAC												
WHT	65	49	38	66	55	37	56					
FRL	57	48	32	55	43	29	35					

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	67	68	56	67	65	56	76					
SWD	24	47	44	41	65	54						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	25	60		25	50							
HSP												
MUL	73	83		58	67							
PAC												
WHT	68	68	51	71	65	56	82					
FRL	61	69	61	60	61	52	70					

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

Students with disabilities data has been below proficiency levels for the past several years. This population of students have been receiving instruction based on their individual needs at their level and tier I instruction on their grade level. The Tier I instruction is not being scaffolded enough for these students to grasp the content being given. When looking at the FAST data in grades 3-6, specifically for students with disabilities, 23% of students were proficient in ELA.

When analyzing iReady and FAST data from our students in grades K-2, there are large discrepancies between the overall proficiency levels. See below:
iReady/FAST-
Kindergarten: 87%/65%
1st Grade: 66%/44%
2nd Grade: 78%/58%
These results could be very different due to the test being new to test takers and administrators and/or the many issues within the testing platform.

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

According to the 21-22 FSA data, 36% of our 5th grade SWD were proficient compared to 22-23 FAST data where 25% of our 5th grade SWD were proficient. According to the 21-22 FSA data, 25% of our 4th

grade SWD were proficient compared to 22-23 FAST data where 14% of our 4th grade SWD were proficient. Although these are two different assessments, we are looking at proficiency of the standards. Each of these grade levels decreased by 11%. Factors that contributed to this decline could have been the different testing platform and our verbatim students did not have a human reader.

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 analyzing overall proficiency rates of students in grades 3-6 taking the FAST assessment, Pinewood's students performed above the state in every grade level. Our 4th grade students had the smallest gap of 62% proficient compared to the state which had 58% proficient.

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

Our 6th grade SWD increased from 17% proficiency in 21-22 to 30% proficiency in 22-23. Our Gen Ed 6th graders improved from 62% proficient in 21-22 to 76% proficient in 22-23. Departmentalized teachers met monthly to discuss strategies and implement new ways of learning/teaching. Our 6th grade teachers worked very hard to have open lines of communication with parents all year so parents knew exactly how their child was progressing and/or how they could help. Lastly, our 5th and 6th grade teams began to vertically plan to ensure students are coming to 6th grade prepared to take on middle school standards.

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

A potential area of concern are those in attendance below 90%. We have 92 students whose attendance is below 90%. These students are losing instructional time that could attribute to higher proficiency levels. Another area of concern is our number of level 1s in ELA (42 students).

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

1. Closing gaps with our lowest 25th percentile of students and our SWD through conducting interventions consistently and with fidelity.
2. Educating teachers on what strong Tier 1 instruction is so all students are receiving rigorous standards-based instruction.
3. Providing support outside of the classroom for students struggling academically and/or personally so each student is able to learn at their highest potential (Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction).

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.

According to FAST ELA data, proficiency levels are at 61%. This leaves 39% of our students not at mastery level of the standards being addressed in the classroom.

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

PM3 FAST 2023 data:
Kindergarten: 65%
1st Grade: 44%
2nd Grade: 58%
3rd grade: 61%
4th grade: 62%
5th grade: 68%
6th grade: 76%

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

Student data from the ELA FAST PM1 and PM2 assessments will be monitored to ensure the students are on target for proficiency on the PM3 ELA FAST assessment. Benchmark Advance Unit assessments will be tracked to monitor progression towards mastery of the benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will participate in coaching cycles conducted by the Literacy Coach and be given feedback from administration after walkthroughs are conducted. Teachers will also plan with the Literacy Coach to enhance their instruction. Teachers will use student data to form small group instruction to bridge gaps in learning.

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

Utilizing instructional coaching and planning will help teachers provide rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards. Students will receive differentiated instruction in small groups, as needed. This will in turn improve student achievement.

Instructional Coaching: Effect size- .88
Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction: Effect size- .75

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.

The Leadership team will meet and develop specific "look-fors" when conducting walkthroughs. These will be developed by analyzing BPS' IPPAS system. The "look-fors" will be presented to staff so everyone is aware of the expectations during Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

By When: September, 2023

The Literacy Coach will schedule times for each team to meet with her. The team will review Benchmark Advance materials, plan with the end in mind, and develop purposeful question strategies to scaffold students' development of standards. Furthermore, the Literacy coach will conduct the coaching cycle with teachers to enhance Tier 1 instruction with students in specific classes.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Vaughan (vaughan.kathleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: Each quarter

Administration will conduct walkthroughs using the "look-fors" document and provide timely feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible: Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Provide PD to teachers and help plan for the daily use of Magnetic Readers to strengthen phonics instruction as a whole group before breaking into needs-based small groups.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Vaughan (vaughan.kathleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: September, 2023

#2. 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.

Our students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup improved proficiency from 21-22 to 22-23; however our proficiency level is still only 35%. Our SWD have achieved proficiency below the federal index for multiple years.

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

SWD ELA proficiency from 35% (FAST 2023) to 45% (FAST 2024).

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

SWD subgroup proficiency growth will be monitored with FAST PM1, PM2 and PM3 along with iReady diagnostic assessments for the fall, winter and spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To address the underperforming subgroup of students with disabilities (SWD), ESE teachers will plan collaboratively with inclusion teachers and will use our Benchmark curriculum to target the specific needs of individual students. All SWD students will receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions using evidence-based programs to bridge gaps in learning. Data will be gathered to ensure students are working towards meeting benchmarks.

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

61% of students are proficient in ELA based on the 22-23 FAST ELA data, while only 35% of students with disabilities are proficient. Implementation of high quality ELA instructional materials effectively will support explicit instruction of vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and comprehension. ESE teachers and inclusion teachers planning collaboratively will ensure high quality instructional materials are being used to meet the individual needs of our SWD population. Inclusion teachers and ESE teachers will be scaffolding their Tier 2 groups strategically and providing the Tier 3 interventions students need to bridge gaps.

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.

Identify SWD subgroup and analyze student data to identify gaps. Work with ESE team to schedule students based on student needs in each class to build schoolwide schedules around maximizing inclusion opportunities.

Person Responsible: Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

By When: July, 2023

Data driven small groups based on weekly benchmarks and PM data during Tier 2 instruction.

Person Responsible: Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monitored monthly through conducting walkthroughs during teacher's reading block. Providing teacher feedback after each walkthrough and individual coaching sessions as needed.

Students will be monitored on their IEP goals as well as PM assessments to identify additional gaps that may need to be adjusted during instructional groups.

Person Responsible: Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

By When: After PM1 and PM2, data team meetings will be held to analyze the current data and discuss changes that may need to be made to IEP goals or class instruction.

#3. 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.

When specifically looking at our EWS indicators, 21 students (61%) are not showing proficiency according to FAST ELA PM3 (2023). By providing more positive encouragement and goal setting strategies, they will know that our staff cares about them and wants them there to learn and meet their goals.

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

According to FAST ELA PM3 2023 data, only 61% of students with 1+ EWS indicators are proficient. Our goal will be to increase proficiency to 70% according to FAST ELA PM3 2024.

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

Specifically, of the 61% of students who are not proficient in ELA, 12 of those students are a level 1 and 9 of those students are a level 2. Each of those students will be paired with a staff member who will conduct regular meetings with them and weekly check-ins to provide encouragement, a mentorship, and guidance towards success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Vaughan (vaughan.kathleen@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Staff across the campus will be partnered with a few students who become theirs for the year. The staff member will provide those students with an opportunity to assess their own learning, provide feedback and become a mentor to that student. Each mentor will begin goal setting with the student so their success will be visible and measurable. The mentor will be someone else at Pinewood to encourage and build the self esteem of the students who would normally not get the positive support all the time.

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

Students need to know that the school cares for them and wants them to be successful. Setting success criteria, providing each student with frequent encouragement/feedback and establishing strong teacher/ student relationships will motive students to grow academically.

Success Criteria: Effect size- .88
Feedback: Effect size- .73
Teacher - Student Relationships: Effect size- .52

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 2 - Moderate 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.

The Leadership team will form a list of students who have 1 or more Early Warning Indicator. Together, the Leadership team and Pinewood's PBIS team will assign teachers with a few students each.

Person Responsible: Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

By When: September, 2023

Pinewood's PBIS team will hold monthly meetings to discuss how the student/teacher relationships are working. Teachers will keep track of meeting dates with each of their students and follow up with classroom teachers to monitor their progress.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Vaughan (vaughan.kathleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Administration will track progress of the students using PM1 and PM2 data (FAST, iReady) along with Benchmark unit assessments.

Person Responsible: Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

#4. 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.

According to FAST ELA data in grades 3-6, proficiency levels are at 67%. According to FAST/ Renaissance ELA data in grades K-2, proficiency levels are at 56%.This places about 39% of our students in need of an intervention due to gaps in their learning.

According to FAST Math data in grades 3-6, proficiency levels are at 66%. According to FAST/ Renaissance ELA data in grades K-2, proficiency levels are at 62%.This places about 36% of our students in need of a math intervention due to gaps in their learning.

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

Recognizing that some of these students are significantly deficient, we will focus on learning gains. We hope to see 80% of the students who scored a level 1 or 2 in grades 3-6 and below the 50th percentile in grades K-2 make a learning gain. There are discrepancies between our ELA iReady and Renaissance testing in grades K-2. iReady testing shows a proficiency of 76% while Renaissance shows a proficiency of 56% in ELA.

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

After each iReady diagnostic and FAST assessment, students receiving intervention will be analyzed to ensure progress is being made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use student data to form Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups and provide small group instruction to bridge gaps in learning. Teachers will use the 95% program, Lexia, and the iReady toolbox for specific areas of growth (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension). In math, teachers will focus on repetition of facts to build fluency.

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

Interventions will be conducted following the BPS decision trees as a guide. Students who are significantly deficient have gaps in their learning. By using the tools BPS provides (95% Group, Lexia, PSI/PASI, DIBELS), we will be able to target specific gaps in each student's learning, fill those gaps, and begin to accelerate learning.

Response to Intervention: Effect size- 1.29
Acceleration Programs: Effect size- .68

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.

Administration will identify students who scored a level 1 or 2 on PM3, 2023. The Literacy Coach, Title I Coordinator and Administration will develop a plan of what initial assessments teachers need to give these students to begin an intervention plan within the first few weeks of the new school year.

Person Responsible: Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

By When: Pre-planning 2023

The Title I Coordinator will gather assessment materials and provide PD to teachers on how students should be assessed. Furthermore, she will guide teachers in the documentation process needed for the IPST process.

Person Responsible: Liana Coulson (coulson.liana@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

The Title I Coordinator will lead data chats with each grade level. She will guide discussions to help teachers disseminate their class data into specific areas needed for growth. Teachers will leave with intervention groups developed and materials needed to drive individualized instruction.

Person Responsible: Liana Coulson (coulson.liana@brevardschools.org)

By When: Bi-Weekly

Administration will conduct walkthroughs to ensure students are receiving research-based interventions with fidelity and provide feedback/PD to teachers. Administration will also sit in on data chats to ensure data is being kept following BPS guidelines for the IPST process.

Person Responsible: Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Use Title I funded Instructional Assistants to provide Tier 2 interventions to students. (T1)

Person Responsible: Liana Coulson (coulson.liana@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers and Title I Instructional Assistants (T1) will work with students to provide small groups/ interventions at the end of the math block to build students' knowledge of their basic math facts (K-2: addition, subtraction 3-6: multiplication, division).

Person Responsible: Amber Smith (smith.amber@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

To begin finding our school's needs for the 2023-2024 school year, we gathered schoolwide data to present to staff. The data consisted of demographics, attendance, discipline, iReady diagnostic and FAST data from PM3, 2023. During the summer, we sent this data mentioned above to teachers and stakeholders and assigned them the task of analyzing the data further on their own. Teachers would then determine subject priority needs and parent/family education and communication priority needs. After determining the needs, teachers were

asked to come up with suggestions and strategies for each one. Last, teachers could provide their input for any other areas of focus that should be considered but were not addressed in the data presented.

Community members and all parents were invited to a SAC meeting to contribute input on how to improve our school and make recommendations regarding student needs. During the SAC meeting, these items mentioned above were reviewed and input was given regarding priority needs and suggestions of how to improve student achievement.

After taking all the suggestions, strategies, and possible action plans that were discussed from teachers and stakeholders the leadership team met to discuss all the information that had been collected. During the Leadership meeting, members collaborated to find the highest priority needs and best strategies our school could use to bridge gaps and show improvements towards student gains.

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

iReady/FAST-
Kindergarten: 87%/65%
1st Grade: 66%/44%
2nd Grade: 78%/58%

It is clear that Pinewood's teachers and students need to practice using the Renaissance platform prior to testing. Students will be guided through a practice test session prior to the assessment being given. Each grade level will be given specific guidance from our Literacy Coach when planning collaboratively with the ESE teachers. The Literacy Coach will provide questioning strategies to teachers so there will be intentional questions (varying in intensity) throughout each lesson. This will also lend itself to improved scaffolding techniques during Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction. Our Title I Coordinator will guide teachers in analyzing their classroom data to look for gaps in their students learning. This will allow students who need Tier 3 interventions to receive intensive remediation at a specific level (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension). Students will be progress monitored after PM1 and PM2, along with after each Benchmark Unit Assessment to determine if interventions or small groups are needed or need to be changed.

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

iReady/FAST-
3rd Grade: 73%/61%
4th Grade: 62%/62%
5th Grade: 66%/68%

Each grade level will be given specific guidance from our Literacy Coach when planning collaboratively with the ESE teachers. The Literacy Coach will provide questioning strategies to teachers so there will be intentional questions (varying in intensity) throughout each lesson. This will also lend itself to improved scaffolding techniques during Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction. Our Title I Coordinator will guide teachers in analyzing their classroom data to look for gaps in their students learning. This will allow students who need Tier 3 interventions to receive intensive remediation at a specific level (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension). Students will be progress monitored after PM1 and PM2, along with after each Benchmark Unit Assessment to determine if interventions or small groups are needed or need to be changed.

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

Based on 22-23 school year trends from the previous grade level, these are attainable goals for the 23-24 year.
FAST/Renaissance 22-23 ELA Results:
Kindergarten: PM3- 65%
1st Grade: PM3- 44%
2nd Grade: PM3- 58%

iReady ELA Goals
Kindergarten: PM1- 50%, PM2- 60%, PM3- 75%
1st Grade: PM1- 50%, PM2- 60%, PM3- 70%
2nd Grade: PM1- 50%, PM2- 60%, PM3- 70%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on 22-23 school year trends from the previous grade level, these are attainable goals for the 23-24 year.

FAST 22-23 ELA Results
3rd Grade: PM3- 61%
4th Grade: PM3- 62%
5th Grade: PM3- 68%

FAST ELA Goals
3rd Grade: PM1- 40%, PM2- 55%, PM3- 70%

4th Grade: PM1- 50%, PM2- 60%, PM3- 70%
5th Grade: PM1- 55%, PM2- 65%, PM3- 75%
6th Grade: PM1- 50%, PM2- 70%, PM3- 80%

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.

- PM1 and PM2 FAST
- iReady D1 and D2
- Walkthroughs with feedback
- Analyzing results of Benchmark assessments
- Schoolwide Lexia usage to support closing gaps for all students
- Interventions conducted with fidelity by using research-based systems and analyzing the data
- Intervention groups will be monitored and changed to ensure all students' individual needs are being met

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

Vaughan, Kathleen, vaughan.kathleen@brevardschools.org

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?

- Explicit instruction to model/demonstrate content while providing visual and auditory examples
- Systematic instruction using a logical progression (simple to complex) and providing students opportunities to demonstrate their knowledge while progressing towards their goals
- Scaffolding instruction using intentional questioning strategies for students' thinking to progress
- Using Lexia for all students and specifically in Tier 3 supports which directly align with building students' phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and the Science of Reading domains (Strong level of evidence)
- 95% Group provides a strong research based intervention system for struggling readers and allows teachers to begin intervening at the student's highest need (Strong level of evidence)
- Collaborative planning between ESE teachers and grade level teachers
- Magnetic Reader program allow teachers to begin building a strong phonemic awareness and phonics foundation in the earlier grades for students to grow through the Science of Reading in upper grades (Strong level of evidence)

- iReady provides a universal screener which provides teachers the ability to goal set with individual students and provide specific feedback for areas of improvement (Promising level of evidence)
- Benchmark Advance provides high-quality ELA instructional materials to students. When used with fidelity students will be introduced to explicit instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

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?

All evidence-based practices/programs addressed identify the need of improving literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven effectiveness for the target population as they are all standards aligned, aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan, are either systematic or explicit, and are all focused on bridging gaps with struggling readers.

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
Administration will clearly define and communicate the expectations for planning sessions with coaches and teachers, and develop content area planning protocols that are aligned with Benchmark Advanced or other research-based intervention materials.	Robinson, Mitzi, robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org
The leadership team will lesson plan with teachers, model, co-teach, engage in reflective conversations, and engage in data chats. During planning, the focus will be on the instructional model, strategies, purposeful questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) that are being taught. The literacy coach will plan for supports teachers will need before, during, and after planning. Interventions will be provided from the general education teacher, ESE teacher, and Title I staff. The literacy coach will work with these staff members to ensure all are providing researched-based instruction with fidelity.	Vaughan, Kathleen, vaughan.kathleen@brevardschools.org
Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS, PASI/PSI, and 95% group to monitor specific reading skills. The Title I Coordinator and Assistant Principal will work with teachers to define performance criteria that prompts additional needs for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.	Smith, Amber, smith.amber@brevardschools.org
The Title I coordinator will guide data chats regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, iReady, FAST, and intervention OPMs to determine next steps of individual students.	Coulson, Liana, coulson.liana@brevardschools.org
The Leadership Team will provide job embedded PD and targeted coaching cycles. PD on instructional materials and intervention materials will be provided by the Literacy Coach, Title I Coordinator and administration.	Smith, Amber, smith.amber@brevardschools.org

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.

Pinewood's SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP will be communicated, not only through out school's website, but also to our staff during a monthly staff meeting, on all of our social media platforms, shared at our next SAC meeting, and provided at our next Title I family night in September.

Pinewood's webpage where the link to our SIP is available: https://www.brevardschools.org/domain/7415

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))

Pinewood hosts several family involvement events throughout the school year including grade level specific curriculum nights/open house, Award Ceremonies with student performances, Math Night, Pinewood Page Turners twice per year, National Literacy Week, Bedtime Story Night, Taste of Kindergarten, Winter and Spring Chorus Performances, Volunteer Breakfast, PBIS incentives to include parent involvement in order to reach most parents. We see there may be gaps and parents we don't reach, so Pinewood communicates regularly with families and community stakeholders through Facebook posts, flyers, and a bi-weekly newsletter.

Pinewood builds relationships with the community through several activities and events including registration day, Feeder Chain Homecoming Parade, community parades, and having business partners volunteer time and resources that improve student achievement. A local church and Second Harvest provide students meals to take home on the weekend. Our business Partner, First Baptist Church of Aurantia provides events and a clothing closet for our students. A Science Fair night, Art Fair, and music programs provide families an opportunity to observe their child's learning.

The School Advisory Council provides parents and community members a voice in school decision making. We request feedback on decisions through newsletters and online surveys and offer exit slips at the end of all parent involvement nights requesting opinions of families. In order to create a positive learning environment, Pinewood utilizes PBIS. PBIS involves not just students and faculty, but also the community. Teachers provide classroom PBIS incentives and the PBIS team organizes a variety of school wide rewards including a quarterly PAW Store, lunch rewards, and special events. Community partners and parent volunteers support these events.

Webpage where Parent and Family Engagement Plan is available: https://www.brevardschools.org/domain/7415

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 II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Pinewood offers a multitude of materials that parents can check out to work with their child at home. We have resources for every grade level and subject and offer to train parents in using them. Our Literacy Coach works directly with teachers/parents to provide them with book bags sent home each week on that student's specific reading level and based upon individual interests. (T1) Pinewood offers ASP during the Winter and into Spring to help those struggling to make progress towards mastery of the end of year standards. The past few years, Pinewood has offered Summer Enrichment programs to help prevent a summer slide with students.

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))

ESSA - ASP
Nutrition Programs - Second Harvest & Children's Hunger Project

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))

Identifying students who are in need based off of discipline data, PBIS data, team meetings. We use a counselor through Lifetime Counseling and Kinder consulting on a consult basis. Mental Wellness forms are used when referring students who may need assistance (mental health counseling, check in/outs, mentoring).

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))

n/a

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).

Pinewood follows BPS guidance when carrying out our schoolwide PBIS system. Pinewood has many positive incentives offered to students throughout the year like popcorn, popsicles, kickball games, sponge admin, craft activities and field trips to the Mims Public Library. PAW bucks are given to students anytime they are caught doing something good and then they can trade them in to participate in our PBIS events. The PBIS team also meets monthly to discuss any students who have received more than 1 referral and a plan to help those students stay on the track towards success.

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))

n/a

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))

n/a