

District School Board of Madison County

Pinetta Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Pinetta Elementary School

135 NE EMPRESS TREE AVE, Pinetta, FL 32350

<http://pes.madison.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Yolanda Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 9/21/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	94%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Madison 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Pinetta Elementary School

135 NE EMPRESS TREE AVE, Pinetta, FL 32350

<http://pes.madison.k12.fl.us/>

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)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Madison 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.

We believe all children can be successful, just not on the same day in the same way.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pinetta Elementary School is committed to providing an environment which will enhance the growth and development of the whole child.

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
Kendrick, Amy	Principal	Mrs. Kendrick is in her 4th year as the instructional leader of Pinetta Elementary and believes all students can learn, given the opportunity and the right tools.
Raines, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Raines serves the whole school working with Exceptional Educational students, as well as Regular Education students meeting their individual needs.
Christmas, Lewis	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Christmas is a K-12 teacher
Minor, Christi	Other	Mrs. Minor serves a multi role position at the school. one of Coordinator and the other as RTI specialist. Mrs. Minor works with Mrs Raines to make sure students are receiving what they need and getting the individualized instruction. She also works with the teachers to serve their needs and develop them.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/21/2020, Yolanda Davis

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	94%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	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	
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	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/21/2020

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	3	4	1	4	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	0	7	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	

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	2	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	4	1	4	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	0	7	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	53%	52%	57%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	50%	58%	50%	47%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	49%	53%	55%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	57%	63%	75%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	49%	62%	76%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	43%	51%	58%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	56%	53%	72%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	44%	40%	4%	58%	-14%
	2018	73%	55%	18%	57%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	50%	7%	58%	-1%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	53%	46%	7%	56%	-3%
	2018	61%	38%	23%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	45%	15%	62%	-2%
	2018	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	51%	10%	64%	-3%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	67%	44%	23%	60%	7%
	2018	76%	44%	32%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	42%	7%	53%	-4%
	2018	66%	38%	28%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	33	36		62	71		42				
BLK	30	33		32	53						
WHT	60	49	40	72	67	45	56				
FRL	51	40	23	62	63	46	57				
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	33	44		52	56						
BLK	40	47		56	58	50					
WHT	71	60		73	69		95				
FRL	57	58	42	68	69	40	63				
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	43			65							
BLK	28			50							
WHT	64	50		79	76		71				
FRL	48	58		69	77						

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	56
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	49
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.

ELA lowest 25th component showed the lowest performance at 33%. There were several contributing factors to the ELA scores not progressing as well as they should have. Contributing factor could be the high number of SWD students throughout. Although these students made gains, it was not enough to count towards the states mandated measurement to count.

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

Science component showed the greatest decline dropping 17 points from the prior year from 70% to 53%. There are several factors that could possibly contribute to this. Last year was the Science adoption year and Madison County School System chose to adopt Pearson Elevate, leaving Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Fusion.

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.

Compared to the state average, reading shows the greatest gap. There is only a -4% gap between the state average and Pinetta in reading achievement. There is a -13% gap in learning gains and a -20% gap in lowest 25th percentile in reading compared to the state average.

There were two new reading teachers to Pinetta Elementary School. Both of the teachers were Effective teachers who came to Pinetta from a neighboring lower achieving school in the district. Mrs. Stacy Lee has had teaching experience in the upper grades, but Mrs. Emily Shadrick's experience comes mostly from 2nd grade.

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

The data component which made the most gains was Math bottom 25% with 37% making gains on 2018 to 53% making gains on 2019 Math FSA. Although one of our teacher was new to the school and grade level, the other teacher is a experienced teacher with 39 years experience. A new action the school was utilizing was Team Time. During this time, students are broken into small groups to work on specific skills that need remediation.

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

There is definitely a link and trend with the number of absences and it effects on student learning as it results to student retention's and student achievement on Math and Reading FSA. We will continue to recognize perfect attendance at every 9 week Pow-Wow. We will also continue to meet as SIT on students that have a high number of absences.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. ELA Achievement (including black/non-Hispanic. This sub group fell below the recommended 41%, at 37%)
4. Science
5. Math Lowest 25th Percentile.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

According to ESSA(Every Student Succeeds Act)Black/Non-Hispanic students scores fell below 41% to 37% in reading and math achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Based on the 2021 FSA reading achievement, black/non Hispanic students will meet the Federal Index of 41% or above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Kendrick (amy.kendrick@mcsbfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Rtl- every day there is a built in Rtl time for students to focus on specific skills they are not being successful. Every grade level will have a 30 minute "Team Time" that students will receive Tiered instruction based on their individual needs, as measured by iReady and Read Naturally placements.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will spend 30 minutes a day doing Read Naturally, which is a district approved intervention listed in the District Reading Plan. This is a research based program which utilizes research based reading strategies, such as teacher modeling, repeated reading, and progress monitoring. Panetta Elementary school has also purchased Leveled Literacy Interventions (LLI), another research based reading program for reading interventions in grade 1-3, which are the key years of instruction for learning to read.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Based on 2019 SSS Science assessment, we dropped 17% from the 2018 SSS Science Assessment.

As a school, Pinetta Elementary School will be utilizing inquiry based learning and project based learning in science and in all grades

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.

Pinetta Elementary School believes in involving parents in all aspects of school life. The Parent/Teacher Organization (PTO) holds monthly meetings, and all parents are invited to attend. Our SAC team meets quarterly prior to PTO meetings.

The PTO sponsors family programs at P.E.S. throughout the year. These activities may include Muffins with Mom, Donuts with Dad, Lunch with Grandparents, Family Talent Show, etc. At the beginning of the school term, P.E.S. holds an Open House for its parents to meet the teachers and ask any questions they may have concerning the school year.

Pinetta Elementary hosts a Literacy Night in the fall of every school year. Teachers prepare quick learning activities that the parents can make and take home to work with their students.

Teachers hold parent conferences at various times during the day (during school and after school) to accommodate parents' schedules. Parent data chats are scheduled at least once during the school year to review student current and past data.

ClassDojo has been implemented this year school-wide from grades PreK to 5. Through ClassDojo, teachers communicate behavior, good or bad; share student work; and communicate with parents on a weekly, sometimes daily, basis. Peachjar is being implemented district wide. This is a site that allows the school to develop online flyers to disseminate regarding upcoming events.

Monthly, each teacher chooses a Citizen of the Month, This student has zero behavior problems and is a positive role model to their peers. Full Circle Dairy, a local dairy company, sponsors a monthly ice cream party to celebrate these individuals.

A school website is used to relay important dates, events, and happenings at the school, as well as in the district. Parents have access via the internet.

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: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------