

Collier County Public Schools

Pine Ridge Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Ridge Middle School

1515 PINE RIDGE RD, Naples, FL 34109

<https://www.collierschools.com/prm>

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Gordon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
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: A (74%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Collier 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Ridge Middle School

1515 PINE RIDGE RD, Naples, FL 34109

<https://www.collierschools.com/prm>

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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.

Our mission is to deliver an excellent education, prepare students for future challenges and opportunities, and empower all learners to achieve and succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will complete school prepared for ongoing learning as well as community and global responsibilities.

P - Prepared

R - Responsible

M - Motivated

S - Safe

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
Kinsley, Sean	Principal	Team members meet with the grade level Professional Learning Communities in which Team Leaders conduct problem solving sessions. Leadership team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and analysis. At these meetings student data is discussed, analyzed, and submitted to the appropriate district site. Data driven decisions are made and continuous student improvement is the focus of discussion. Academic as well as behavior data is reviewed. Data Warehouse is utilized to list specific populations who need to be targeted by progress indicators. Based on data, fidelity of academic and behavioral services delivered is monitored .
Garbo, Lauri	Assistant Principal	
higgins, jane	Instructional Coach	
Spencer, Brett	Teacher, ESE	
Coloma, Ashley	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/6/2020, Michelle Gordon

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.*

9

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
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: A (74%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	297	356	317	0	0	0	0	970	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	9	0	0	0	0	25	
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	6	7	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	0	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	37	23	0	0	0	0	80	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	31	11	0	0	0	0	68	

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	3	12	9	0	0	0	0	24	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/23/2020

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	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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide 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	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	6	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	329	352	347	0	0	0	0	1028
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27	14	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	20	33	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	65	54	0	0	0	0	167

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	6	13	9	13	0	0	0	0	41

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	78%	59%	54%	75%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	55%	54%	68%	60%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	45%	47%	52%	48%	44%
Math Achievement	83%	69%	58%	86%	70%	56%
Math Learning Gains	68%	62%	57%	74%	69%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	57%	51%	75%	67%	50%
Science Achievement	75%	55%	51%	73%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	75%	72%	90%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	75%	56%	19%	54%	21%
	2018	77%	56%	21%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	76%	55%	21%	52%	24%
	2018	76%	54%	22%	51%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	79%	58%	21%	56%	23%
	2018	79%	63%	16%	58%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	81%	61%	20%	55%	26%
	2018	79%	62%	17%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	81%	66%	15%	54%	27%
	2018	84%	67%	17%	54%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	58%	36%	22%	46%	12%
	2018	54%	43%	11%	45%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	74%	52%	22%	48%	26%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	50%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	72%	15%	71%	16%
2018	84%	70%	14%	71%	13%
Compare		3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	67%	24%	61%	30%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	88%	67%	21%	62%	26%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	67%	-67%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	42	53	51	50	52	49	42	59	86		
ELL	46	50	50	68	65	70	48	59	89		
ASN	85	58		95	74		93	91	100		
BLK	59	56	53	66	58	61	50	60	90		
HSP	63	59	54	75	62	64	56	78	91		
MUL	88	76		92	76			100			
WHT	86	67	59	87	71	60	85	93	93		
FRL	67	57	53	75	63	63	60	79	86		
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	32	34	34	47	51	55	30	66	62		
ELL	38	53	42	57	64	64	33	69			
ASN	90	76		95	89		86	100	92		
BLK	50	52	53	62	71	78	44		73		
HSP	61	58	46	73	67	63	61	77	87		
MUL	81	74		94	80		88		100		
WHT	87	70	58	87	72	70	80	92	86		
FRL	65	57	49	74	67	67	63	79	83		
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	30	45	40	59	70	70	27	65	57		
ELL	36	70	67	58	69	74	29	59	30		
AMI	55	80		82	64						
ASN	85	86		94	86			85	100		
BLK	48	58	50	74	79	67		83			
HSP	59	62	52	78	71	73	60	80	69		
MUL	78	73		88	80		73	87			

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
WHT	85	70	49	91	75	81	81	98	85		
FRL	57	60	49	76	74	76	55	79	58		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	736
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
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	86
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 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	78
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	67
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.

SWD - Students with Disabilities scored low in the following areas.

1) 42% ELA Achievement, 2) 42% Science Achievement

Students with Disabilities are strategically scheduled to maximize support offered to each student.

Electronic resources are provided to support learning. Read 180 and System 44 are two online programs that support student learning. Teachers are in year 2 of using these programs.

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

Math Lowest 25% Percentile dropped from 68% in 2018 to 63% in 2019. Even though this current percent is above both the district and state average, it is still our largest drop. We currently have experienced teachers working with our Intensive students and will continue to focus on using ALEXS program for additional support.

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.

Every component at Pine Ridge Middle School was at least 10% or higher compared to the state average.

Grade 6 ELA did show a slight GAP of 1% from Quarter 1 Benchmark Assessment to Quarter 2 Benchmark Assessment which was also 1% difference from 2019 Grade 6 ELA State Assessment results.

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

Science was the area that showed the most improvement compared to other middle school in the county. Pine Ridge was one of only two middle schools to make gains from 2018-2019. We also had the highest scores in the county.

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

We currently have no subgroups that fall below 41%. Currently, Students with disabilities is 54%. This would be the group we monitor moving forward.

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

1. Decrease our level 1 & 2 in ELA by at least 5%
2. Decrease our level 1 & 2 in Math by at least 5%
3. Increase our Science pass rate by at least 5%
4. Increase the participation and awareness of district and school SEL initiatives

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Writing Daily Across the Content Areas
Description and Rationale:	When students are given the opportunity to write in their core subject areas, they are writing minimal answers with a lack of concern towards conventions and proper grammar.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers are requiring students to elaborate when answering questions in all four Core subject areas, with an emphasis on proper grammar and conventions, then students (specifically the lowest 25%) will increase their chances of answers questions correctly and completely on the FSA assessments and district assessments by at least 5 percentage points. They will also become active learners of content when asked to respond in writing versus auditory only.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher observation, Instructional rounds, and authentic individualized feedback will support this area of focus. Professional Development Common Planning on a weekly basis will also be implemented. R.A.C.E. Strategy, CER (Claim, Evidence, Reasoning), Immersive Reader (ELL), and use of the Writing Instructional tool as a progress monitoring tool will also be used.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	State Assessments have shifted from Multiple Choice type questions to narrative response questions. Students are now required to pull information from multiple sources and write explanations to questions asked. The Reading Coach will provide assistance as needed to support this focus area.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will offer daily opportunities for students to practice writing across all content areas.
 CER will be used weekly (Social Studies and Science)
 R.A.C.E. will be used weekly in all four Core Subject Areas
 Immersive Reader will be used with our struggling learners
 Individualized Authentic Feedback will provided to students during the writing process
 Modeling Effective Writing Strategies on a weekly basis

Person Responsible jane higgins (higgij3@collierschools.com2)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Increased Rigor

Description and Rationale: When higher order/deep understanding questions are used, students are still not held accountable for answering at equally deep levels. This continues to be an issue with our Advanced and Gifted students. Results on the FSA Assessments show smaller gains versus students in other sub groups.

Measurable Outcome: If teacher questions and teacher/student discourse demonstrate a high level of rigor and cognitive complexity, then all students will have a deep understanding and knowledge consistent with the demands of the state standards resulting in a 5% increase in student achievement as measured by the state assessments and quarterly benchmark assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: District provides professional development opportunities in the following areas including Rigor, Engagement, and Developing high order questioning. These strategies are used to support all levels of learning in all core areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increased rigor across the content areas will increase student knowledge base and higher order thinking skills. These skills are crucial to address the complexity of the FSA Standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Reading Coach & administration will provide multiple staff development opportunities to support this area. Teachers will have opportunities to share best practices throughout the year.

Comparing and Contrasting using multiple resources

Incorporating Primary Sources when analyzing a concept to respond to a question

Students will have multiple opportunities to apply knowledge learned to a new question or situation

Teachers will utilize learning scales to help students assess their levels of knowledge and understanding as they strive to reach a Level 4.

Person Responsible Sean Kinsley (kinslese@collierschools.com)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A students emotional health is directly related to their ability to learn and engage in both the classroom and virtual environments. Students emotional well being has been impacted greatly due to the current challenges related to the global pandemic.

Measurable Outcome: Past data from student surveys show Emotional Regulation as an area of concern. This objective will be measured using discipline and Handle With Care data as well as current survey data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sean Kinsley (kinslese@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: If the faculty and staff implement strategies gleaned from school and district staff development opportunities related to SEL, then discipline and Handle With Care numbers should decrease by at least 5% from the previous year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on the student survey data over the past year, Pine Ridge students will benefit from an increased focus on SEL (Social Emotional Learning) initiatives at both the school and district level. This is especially true when looking at Emotional Regulation and the increase in student levels of stress, as reported by all stakeholders (i.e. Faculty, Staff, Counselors, administration, parents etc). Resources used to select this strategy include PBS Data, Handle With Care Data, Panorama Student Survey Data, and Discipline Data.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue with the following SEL Strategies:
 Positive Ceiling Tile messages created by students
 Additional Staff trainings and Professional Development opportunities
 Continue with PBS Initiatives
 Continue with We Dine Together initiative and expand membership
 School News is an outlet to share Public Service Announcements and SEL Videos

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.

.

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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.