Pinewood Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pinewood Elementary School

1600 SW 83RD AVE, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Josianne Valme

Start Date for this Principal: 9/27/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Pinewood Elementary School

1600 SW 83RD AVE, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Pinewood Elementary School is to strive to create a learning environment for all students that is conducive to developing a global community of individuals capable of obtaining success in the post-secondary educational setting.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Pinewood Elementary School is to teach and equip all students to navigate the path from Pre-Kindergarten through 5th grade in order to develop critical thinkers who are able to respectfully collaborate and communicate effectively using 21 Century Tools.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Vinson	Assistant Principal	• Discipline/Behavior Support/Referrals • Supervise Faculty and Staff (PK-2 teachers, paras, custodians, guidance, ESE) • Classroom observations and teacher/custodial evaluations • Instructional support/student achievement • Facilitator and Coach for Math and Science • Lowest 25% student support • Bullying Investigative Designee • Threat Assessment -Facilities and Safety monitoring
Walker, Jasmine	Instructional Coach	• Assessments – benchmark, monthly, FSA • Reading Facilitation, Support, and Training • Coaching and Modeling • Test Prep materials and schedules • Academic Camps • Push-ins and additional Support • Administrative Designee • Instructional support/student achievement • Classroom observations • Lowest 25% student support -facilitator • Classroom support -Title One Liaison
Moncrieffe, Patricia	Instructional Coach	• Facilitate Math programs/instruction • Assessments • ACALETICS • IREADY • Coaching and Modeling • Instructional support/student achievement • Classroom support • Lowest 25% student support • School Operations -Safety Patrol -SAC Chair
Odom, Lakia	Instructional Coach	• Facilitate Science/STEM programs/instruction • Science Updates and Training • Science Night • Science IFC and instructional materials -Acalectics Science • Instructional support/student achievement • Lowest 25% student support • School Operations
Amos, Hernrika	Curriculum Resource Teacher	-Literacy Support K-2 • Reading Facilitation, Support and Training

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		• Assessments – benchmark, monthly, • Curriculum updates and training • Coaching and Modeling • Academic Nights and Fairs • Instructional support/student achievement • Lowest 25% student support • School Operations • Classroom support

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/27/2021, Josianne Valme

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
6

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
42

Total number of students enrolled at the school
622

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	86	109	96	94	105	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	19	38	18	22	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	1	21	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	1	10	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/27/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	59%	57%	60%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	60%	58%	68%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	54%	53%	71%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				78%	65%	63%	73%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				80%	66%	62%	75%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				84%	53%	51%	67%	47%	47%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement				59%	46%	53%	58%	49%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	62%	10%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	59%	9%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	65%	0%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	67%	15%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	80%	64%	16%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	49%	8%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady is used to progress monitor all grade levels for ELA and Math. Additionally, for grades 3-5, SchoolCity is used to progress monitor standard based instruction for ELA, Math, and Science.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	88/35.2	87/49.4	89/55.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/28.6	75/42.7	77/49.4
	Students With Disabilities	15/40	14/64.3	15/66.7
	English Language Learners	6/0	6/50	6/66.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	88/27.3	86/36	89/43.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/23.4	74/31.1	77/39
	Students With Disabilities	15/20	14/42.9	15/33.3
	English Language Learners	6/0	6/0	6/50

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85/32.9	86/47.7	86/57
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/32.4	72/48.6	73/56.2
	Students With Disabilities	9/11.1	9/22.2	9/22.2
	English Language Learners	12/16.7	12/25	12/41.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85/13.5	87/35.6	85/45.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/18.3	73/34.2	72/43.1
	Students With Disabilities	9/0	10/20	9/44.4
	English Language Learners	12/16.7	12/25	12/50

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	83/45.8	82/56.1	85/63.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	70/42.9	69/55.1	72/62.5
	Students With Disabilities	14/21.4	14/28.6	13/43.2
	English Language Learners	6/33.3	6/50	6/66.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82/19.5	82/36.6	85/49.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	70/17.1	69/33.3	72/45.8
	Students With Disabilities	14/21.4	14/28.6	13/38.5
	English Language Learners	6/0	6/16.7	6/16.7

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	91/24.2	91/34.1	93/38.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/23.4	76/34.2	78/34.6
	Students With Disabilities	16/6.3	16/18.8	16/25
	English Language Learners	12/8.3	12/8.3	12/16.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	92/20	92/33.7	91/47.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	76/25	77/31.2	76/46.1
	Students With Disabilities	16/25	16/37.5	15/40
	English Language Learners	10/10	12/25.0	12/33.3

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	96/27.1	94/42.6	74/35
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/27.3	75/41.3	60/45
	Students With Disabilities	18/5.6	17/23.5	13/15.4
	English Language Learners	10/20	10/20	8/37.5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	95/30.5	95/48.8	68/72.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	76/32.9	75/48	54/66.7
	Students With Disabilities	16/25.0	17/35.3	6/50
	English Language Learners	10/10	10/20	6/33.3
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	88/0	93/44	84/42
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	35	33		44	65		35				
ELL	50	68		61	71		39				
BLK	54	60	67	60	67	47	50				
HSP	48			69	80						
FRL	51	61	72	60	68	50	43				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	59	76	79	71	92	93	64				
ELL	58	71	69	86	77	83	64				
BLK	66	68	67	76	80	84	58				
HSP	56	75		83	75	80	59				
FRL	64	69	68	80	81	89	60				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	48	71	53	61	72	57	41				
ELL	37	61	58	51	65		40				
BLK	60	70	76	73	76	69	63				
HSP	59	61	60	73	70		48				
FRL	58	68	72	72	74	66	59				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	92%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All subgroups had an upward trend across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Third grade ELA proficiency needed improvement

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The prior third grade student in second grade were significantly deficient in comprehension , second grade teacher had to spend most of ELA instructional time teaching phonics instruction. Hence when the students reported to third grade they were highly deficient in reading comprehension . The action that will be taken is students who are not proficient in Reading will receive double dose and /or triple dose in comprehension

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

5th grade mathematics

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Data driven instruction . Double dose instruction for all tier two and tier three studnts

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Continue to effective methods previously employed and carefully discern what standard the students had difficulty in and spend additional instructional time teaching such as Measurement and algebraic thinking. ELO learning opportunity will be provided to reinforce these skills

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development in effectively teaching Measurement and Algebraic Thinking

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Continue professional development for teachers
Monitor with fidelity and consistently these areas of Mathematics via progress monitoring

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus will align with the district literary initiative.
Measurable Outcome:	By Spring 2022, 68% or more students in grades 3-5 will attain a level 3 or above on the English Language Arts (ELA) Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	Students in grades 3-5 will be monitored by analyzing data from formative assessments such as iReady, Benchmark Assessment System (BAS), SchoolCity, and the Broward Standards Assessments (BSA).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vinson Jones (vinson.jones@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented are targeted reading instruction, small group instruction, differentiated centers, and questioning techniques.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The aforementioned strategies have a proven record to be valid, reliable, and objective to the success of a classroom. Resources: Rally, Curriculum Associates (Ready LAFS), Thinking Maps, CPALMS, Benchmark Advance, B.E.S.T. ELA Standards (K-2), Florida ELA Standards (3-5), SQ3R-Using Questioning Techniques

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze Data
2. Data Chats
3. Professional Learning Community (PLC)
4. Professional Development
5. Collaborative Grade Level Planning

Person Responsible   Jasmine Walker (jasmine.walker@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

PINEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-2811 reported 0.3 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Our violent incident rate per 100 students was 0.15 which is low, our goal is reduce our referrals for fights to 0.10. We will teach school-wide expectations in the classrooms as well as our common areas: cafeteria, hallway and athletic fields. We will use our token economy system to reward students who model positive behaviors.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

SAC participation, curriculum night initiatives, extracurricular programs, and parent participation initiatives will be the drivers for accomplishing our goals as indicated in the PFEP for
Pinewood Elementary School. Addressing the SEL needs of our students and staff is instrumental in creating a warm and pleasant work environment. Additionally, partnerships with local businesses and other potential stakeholders will be sought. SEL instruction is provided
to all students; referrals to outside agencies include, but are not limited to counseling,
financial supports, and housing challenges. Additionally, mentoring programs take place
year-round for both male and female students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Assistant Principal - monitors the school environment to ascertain SEL initiatives are being implemented and done with fidelity and consistency.
Guidance Counselor- Supports teachers in the delivery of SEL instruction and delivers SEL instruction to the
K-2 teachers.
Classroom Teachers - deliver the SEL instruction within the classroom

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	2811 - Pinewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$6,000.00
			Notes: The funds will be utilized for Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) camp teacher salaries to promote and engage in student achievement in all academic areas.			
					Total:	$6,000.00