Pine Forest High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pine Forest High School

2500 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Deborah Ray

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Asian Students* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Escambia 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

Pine Forest High School

2500 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Pine Forest High School's administration, faculty, staff, and community stakeholders will prepare students with the highest level of academic rigor for graduation, post-secondary experiences, and workforce readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pine Forest High School's Core Beliefs are:

All students can learn at the highest level of academic rigor to be successful.

All students can complete a rigorous program of study that will prepare them for their future.

All students can be productive citizens in the school and in the community.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Touchstone, Laura	Principal	
Teasley, Shanae	Dean	
Jordan, Latasha	Assistant Principal	
Gehrke, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
Gray, Ronald	Teacher, K-12	
Osborn, Nathlee	Teacher, K-12	
Burt, Edgar	Teacher, K-12	
Bolling, Rodney	Teacher, K-12	
King, Emily	Assistant Principal	
Gardner, Maryjane	Teacher, K-12	
Irby, Anglea	Teacher, K-12	CTE Department Chair
McBride, Jamiliya	Instructional Coach	Math Coach
Bishop, Billy	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair
Lewis, Larry	Teacher, K-12	Foreign Language Chair
Gladdney, Brittney	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Deborah Ray

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.*

2

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

109

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Asian Students* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	

SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466	445	425	344	1680
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	100	69	8	270
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	113	82	9	289
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	22	10	59
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	66	17	6	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	117	87	5	354
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161	7	0	0	168

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	130	105	11	349

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	17	8	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	28	24	9	82

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 6/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453	443	440	378	1714
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	124	103	78	438
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	142	116	81	461
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	87	61	23	202
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241	195	218	148	802

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	159	149	88	550

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	45	33	0	110
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	29	34	11	106

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453	443	440	378	1714
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	124	103	78	438
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	142	116	81	461
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	87	61	23	202
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241	195	218	148	802

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	159	149	88	550

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	45	33	0	110
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	29	34	11	106

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	33%	49%	56%	34%	48%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	39%	47%	51%	40%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	33%	42%	31%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	29%	42%	51%	23%	43%	49%
Math Learning Gains	48%	48%	48%	31%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	41%	45%	29%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	48%	59%	68%	48%	60%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	44%	62%	73%	48%	62%	70%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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**
09	2019	35%	48%	-13%	55%	-20%
	2018	33%	49%	-16%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	30%	48%	-18%	53%	-23%
	2018	29%	49%	-20%	53%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	58%	-10%	67%	-19%
2018	38%	57%	-19%	65%	-27%
Compare		10%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	62%	-18%	70%	-26%
2018	53%	65%	-12%	68%	-15%
Compare		-9%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	52%	-15%	61%	-24%
2018	29%	51%	-22%	62%	-33%
Compare		8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	23%	47%	-24%	57%	-34%
2018	34%	48%	-14%	56%	-22%
Compare		-11%			

Subgroup Data

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	20	34	27	16	36	33	25	42		78	28
ELL	20	33		47	45			36			
ASN	58	70									
BLK	22	33	26	18	41	44	31	29		88	40

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
HSP	27	43	43	36	63	60	38	56		83	50
MUL	52	47		32	44		77	65		87	62
WHT	47	45	33	41	53	58	69	64		73	60
FRL	30	36	28	26	46	45	43	37		82	44

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	18	42	43	19	40	41	25	34		60	21
ELL	10	43		70						75	25
ASN	35	63		73				73		100	65
BLK	19	36	41	20	34	34	26	35		76	38
HSP	42	39		50	52		53	69		73	27
MUL	45	42		41	46		41	62		67	50
WHT	47	49	32	45	60	70	53	71		76	58
FRL	29	41	34	31	46	36	33	47		75	39

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	13	28	25	11	26	35	24	21		69	18
ELL				20	41	36					
ASN	71	42		56	61		92			67	
BLK	20	35	31	13	26	29	31	30		70	32
HSP	46	41	21	25	24	20	67	65		82	43
MUL	39	44		23	39		67	74		81	52
WHT	47	46	35	34	34	19	61	66		68	61
FRL	28	37	30	20	28	28	41	41		66	39

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

For the 2018-2019 school year, out lowest component was again the 10th grade ELA with 30% of our students scoring proficient in this area. Though it is still our lowest, it is an increase of 1% from the 2017-2018 school year. We are now recognizing this as a trend for this test and graduation requirement.
When looking at our 2020 AP3 scores, only 19% of our 9th students were proficient and 16% were proficient on this test. These are new tests, so we cannot compare them to pervious years, yet the total numbers do show us the total amount of students that would have affected our school grade if we had taken the statewide assessments and we continue to see that this is an area that we need to concentrate on with our students and teachers.

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

For the 2018-2019 school year, our greatest decline was the 9th grade geometry with only 58% of our students scoring proficient in this area. This was a decrease in 11% from the previous school year. As far a geometry, we saw a decrease in 10th and 11th grade as well. 10th grade was at 24% proficiency and had a 9% decrease from the previous year while 11th grade was at 8% proficiency and had a 9% drop from the previous school year. We recognized the need for changes in staff for this area as well as structured coaching and assessment calibration to the state standards.
For 2020, we did adjust the staff in geometry, as well as the department chair, PLC leader, and math coach's concentration. For Q3 for geometry, we had an average of 29%, with only 8% scoring above 50%, only 4.7% scoring above 55%, and 3.1% scoring above 60%. Again, this was a new test and may not have aligned to how the PLC chose to approach their power standards that were chosen using previous years' data and the test specs for the geometry EOC. Data pulled from the PLC

showed increases from the the previous years Common Formative and Summative Assessments, therefore we feel that this overall score would have increased on the assessment had we taken the test.

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.

In the 2018-2019 year, the component that had the biggest gap compared to the state average was the Social
Studies Achievement from our U.S. History EOC scores. There was a 29 point gap
between our proficiency (44%) and the state's average (73%). Of our three teachers in
this areas, two had to be out for medical reasons during the school year.

For the 2020 school year, we only have comparable data for the district using the quarter exams. The greatest gap when compared to the district average was on the biology Q3 test. We were more than 8% below the district average on this assessment. Contributing factors to this were a new teacher in biology, a teacher with multiple preps who taught the course and could not have common planning with the Biology PLC, and the honors teacher left mid-year for family concerns, and was replaced with a brand new teacher.

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

We saw the highest increase in the Algebra EOC with a 29% increase. We also had the
greatest increase in this area during the 2017-2018 school year. Again, we researched
the individual students prior math scores to ensure proper placement in the math
courses. The algebra teaching team also followed the Professional Learning Community
process as well as built strong relationships with students. They looked at common
formative assessment data student by student, standard by standard to ensure that all
students were showing growth towards mastery of the standards.

Again, for the 2020 school year, we only have comparable data for the district using the quarter exams, yet the Algebra PLC was not only almost 5 points above the district average, but also had the highest average in the district on the Q3. As previously stated, the Algebra team maintained and mirrored their actions from the previous year, while adjusting for their different student needs and adding one new teacher and an additional teacher to the team after the 10 day count. The continued to look at common
formative assessment data student by student, standard by standard to ensure that all
students were showing growth towards mastery of the standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. Number of students scoring level 1 on statewide assessments
2. Students with one or more suspensions.

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

1. Increase Learning Gains in ELA, Math FSA's and EOC's.
2. Increase Lowest Quartile in ELA, Math FSA's and EOC's.
3. Increase Geometry proficiency
4. Continue to increase 10th grade ELA proficiency
5. Regain proficiency points on the US History EOC

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our school is fully Standards Based Grading, which starts with our Professional Learning Communities. In order to keep increasing our school grade, we need to continue to fine tune our remediation process through our PLC's school-wide. Helping our PLC's focus on their content, standard by standard and student by student, we will continue to see growth in our needed areas such ELA, U.S. History, Geometry, and out two ESSA subgroups that are below the Federal Index, Students with disabilities and Black students.
Measurable Outcome:	Our 10th grade ELA FSA scores will increase by five points. We will continue to make gains from 30% proficiency to 35% proficiency on the 2021 FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Touchstone (ltouchstone@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide intensive individualized support to students who have fallen off track and face significant challenges to succeed and meet standard mastery. In order to help students that are not reaching proficiency or mastery of standards on Common Formative or Summative Assessments or those students that are chronically absent (our third highest EWS category), or students with behavior issues in a large group setting, our teachers will used data from FOCUS and CFA/CSA's, to schedule these students into their SOAR classes weekly. The small or individualized group setting will allow for more specific scaffolding to take place based on the standard(s) and the indivudal student(s) needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PFHS is continuing to use Standards Based Grading and we are in our 5th years as a PLC school. Our teachers view and share data in order to collaborate so that they can adjust lessons and assessments in an ongoing manner to meet the needs of our students that many not be showing progress in Common Formative and Summative Assessments. Using our daily remediation time, SOAR, we are able to target student by student, standard by standard to help increase scores with targeted instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. For each student identified as needing individualized support based off of Common Formative and Summative Assessments within the course PLC, teachers will assign them to a scheduled SOAR class to help scaffold the standard and build the relationship in order for them to reach mastery.
2. Teachers will create common formative and common summative assessments and react to the data student by student, standard by standard.
3. Teachers will provide systematic interventions.

Person Responsible	Laura Touchstone (ltouchstone@ecsdfl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

1. **Number of students scoring level 1 on statewide assessments**

2. **Students with one or more suspensions.**

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Pine Forest works to build positive relationships with its families by targeting an increase in parental involvement. To achieve this increase, our school will provide frequent opportunities for parents to engage in curricular activities directly related to enhancing student achievement. As Pine Forest increases the level of academic rigor across its curriculum, parents and community members will be asked to provide input on curricular content. As we increase student levels of college and career readiness, parents and community members will be asked to participate in activities that provide graduation requirement information to student grade level cohorts.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00