

Volusia County Schools

Pine Trail Elementary 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Trail Elementary School

300 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pinetrail/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Charles Bynum D

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	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 Volusia 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Trail Elementary School

300 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pinetrail/pages/default.aspx>

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-5	No	51%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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 Trail Elementary is a family of educators working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure academic success for students in an environment that fosters social and emotional well-being.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pine Trail Elementary is a family of educators committed to providing a rich, rigorous learning environment that fosters students' social and emotional well-being where all students achieve academic success through the collaborative efforts of faculty, staff, families and community members.

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
Fisher, Tami	Principal	Instructional leader of the school
Whittle, Jody	Assistant Principal	Assistant Instructional Leader of the school
Larkin, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach providing coaching and support for teachers
Hajdin, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Grade 2
Reamer, Chris	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Grade 1
Witter, Doug	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Kindergarten
Wise, Chace	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Grade 4
Gilbert, Sandra	Teacher, ESE	Teacher of Exceptional Student Education - Support Facilitator
Reynolds, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Grade 5 Gifted

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Charles Bynum D

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

47

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	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	83	82	88	74	110	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
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	1	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Thursday 8/27/2020

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	111	94	104	136	99	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	679
Attendance below 90 percent	11	8	11	18	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
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	10	7	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	5	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	111	94	104	136	99	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	679
Attendance below 90 percent	11	8	11	18	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
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	10	7	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	5	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	70%	56%	57%	73%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	56%	58%	69%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	53%	63%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	59%	63%	79%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	85%	56%	62%	82%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	43%	51%	60%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	57%	53%	75%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	54%	12%	58%	8%
	2018	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	72%	51%	21%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	60%	14%	62%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	65%	58%	7%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	59%	18%	64%	13%
	2018	73%	60%	13%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	79%	54%	25%	60%	19%
	2018	78%	57%	21%	61%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	67%	56%	11%	53%	14%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	30	60	56	40	71	68	8				
ASN	83	64		100	100						
BLK	29	53	36	32	71	58	27				
HSP	71	67		69	75						
MUL	65	70		88							
WHT	76	69	60	85	86	72	70				
FRL	62	67	54	71	81	69	58				
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	30	22	28	30	19	21				
ASN	92			92							
BLK	24	29		42	57						
HSP	63	46		67	69						
MUL	63	73		63	82						
WHT	73	59	44	76	65	28	72				
FRL	61	51	34	65	59	36	56				

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	22	43	47	24	39	25	31				
BLK	28	50		50	67						
HSP	67	60		78	70						
MUL	56			69							
WHT	77	70	61	81	84	59	77				
FRL	65	63	63	70	77	57	61				

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	70
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	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	87
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	44
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	71
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	74
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	74
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	66
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.

The data component of ELA Achievement showed the lowest performance with 73% in Grade 3, 66% in Grade 4 and 67% in Grade 5. There was intensified focus on mathematics instruction which yielded significant increases in math achievements, but diverted laser focus from ELA instructional practices.

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

The data component of ELA achievement showed the greatest decline with a -5% in both Grade 4 and Grade 5. Math achievement had a significant increase across the board. The focus on ELA instruction faltered as the focus on mathematics instruction intensified. A balance must be implemented with fidelity.

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.

All of our data components surpassed the state data.

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

The data component of mathematics achievement showed the most improvement with a 9% increase in Grade 3, 4% increase in Grade 4 and 1% increase in Grade 5. A school-wide emphasis was placed on mathematics instruction, looking closely at implementation of small group instruction.

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

School Leadership Team identified attendance as the EWS indicator with the highest percentages, but had a consensus that the requirements surrounding COVID19 will make this a difficult year to focus on attendance. The indicator the SLT chose to focus on is decreasing the number of out of school suspensions.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. African American Sub-population Achievement
3. Students with Disabilities Sub-population Achievement
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of the needs assessment and analysis, it was revealed that our ELA achievement yielded 70%, ELA learning gains yielded 67% and the lowest quartile performed at 53% which was at or well above state and district averages. Pine Trail Elementary SLT decided to focus on ELA achievement due to the decline of -5% proficient in both grades 4 and 5.

Measurable Outcome: Pine Trail Elementary will increase ELA achievement from 70% to 75%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher-led small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional learning targeted on small group instruction with COVID19 guidelines - Larkin, Stefani

Professional learning based on ELA curriculum presented at Volusia eLearns - Teachers completed online. Jody Whittley monitors attendance.

Professional learning focused on utilizing canvas for instruction - Teachers completed online. Jody Whittley monitors attendance.

Professional learning targeting iReady Instructional components - Teachers completed online. Jody Whittley monitors attendance.

Implementation of professional learning will be monitored through classroom visits, walk-throughs and evaluation cycles. Academic Coach will facilitate coaching cycles with teachers demonstrating difficulty implementing strategies.

Person Responsible Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on observation and team discussion, the SLT identified a need for increased collaborative planning within and across grade levels. The move from brick and mortar instruction to virtual instruction for the last quarter of the 2019-2020 school year due to COVID19 may result in missing learning blocks required for meeting mastery with standards in the subsequent grade level. This makes collaborative planning essential for success.
Measurable Outcome:	Grade level PLC's will meet monthly to review real-time data, identify data trends and determine the best practices to implement to address deficiencies which will yield an increase in grade level achievement. Grade level teams will meet bi-weekly to select or create formative assessments, monitor on-going progress, and share best practices. Leadership team will meet bi-weekly where time will be set aside for team leaders to discuss curriculum correlation needs to address missing learning blocks which will yield an increase in mastery of grade level standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities Data chats
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to John Hattie, "Collective Teacher Efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. With an effect size of $d=1.57$ Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement." Scheduling time for teachers to collaborate and modeling best practices will build collective teacher efficacy.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate monthly PLC's focused on data chats, identifying trends, and determining best practices and strategies to implement - Tami Fisher and Stefani Larkin

Provide time during leadership team meetings for cross-curriculum discussion - Tami Fisher and Jody Whittley

Conduct bi-weekly grade level department meetings - Department Lead Teachers (Trailblazers)

Academic Coach and Instructional Leaders will guide PLC's and model collaborative planning. Academic Coach will stagger attendance at department meetings to offer support as needed.

Person Responsible Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Analysis of our ESSA data revealed that although the subgroups of Black/African-American (44) and Students with Disabilities (48) surpassed the ESSA target of 41 Federal Index Points, SLT felt additional improvement was needed within these targeted groups.

Measurable Outcome: Pine Trail Elementary will increase the FIP score for the sub-population of Black/African-American and Students with Disabilities to 50.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jody Whittley (jlwhittl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group instruction with lowest quartile

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size on student achievement. Florida Center for Reading (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

On-going monitoring of lowest quartile data and review with faculty - Tami Fisher

Facilitate PL for small group instruction during COVID19 - Stefani Larkin

Implementation of professional learning will be monitored through classroom visits, walk-throughs and evaluation cycles. Academic Coach will conduct coaching cycles with teachers demonstrating difficulty implementing strategies. Principal provides teachers with lowest quartile data bi-weekly and it is discussed in department meetings and PLC's.

Person Responsible: Jody Whittley (jlwhittl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The SLT identified an increase in out of school suspension for the 2019-2020. Strategies will be implemented to yield a decrease in this data. Administrators and TOA will utilize the Consequence Matrix developed by the district. Restorative practices will be implemented with fidelity.

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 Trail Elementary's vision and mission statements are a collaboration of our principal and SAC. They are clearly communicated through SAC meetings, PTA meetings and events, website and social media site. PTE faculty and staff work closely with PTA to facilitate events on campus as well as in the community. The principal and assistant principal maintain an open door policy encouraging faculty, staff, students, families and community members to offer suggestions, discuss concerns and problem-solve. All stakeholders are asked to complete our climate survey annually. The data the survey yielded is desegregated by the SLT and reviewed with the SAC, PTA, faculty and staff. Pine Trail Elementary has a history of significant parent/guardian classroom involvement through a multitude of volunteer opportunities, although this will be hindered this school year until positive cases of COVID19 decrease in our district. Our PTA works closely with community business partners to obtain donations for classrooms and students and to organize and host off-campus events. Pine Trail Elementary will continue to allow business partners to purchase banners to display along the property fence line. Pine Trail Elementary has established a positive character life skill list. Each week a different life skill is focused on and communicated by the principal, assistant principal or the school counselor via the news and taught by the teacher through SEL instruction. Any faculty or staff member can award life skill chips to students when they are "caught" effectively demonstrating the life skills. The chips are exchanged for positive rewards. Teachers develop close working relationships with parents/guardians and communicate regularly with families through face-to-face conferences, phone conferences, emails, texts, and various apps such as Class Dojo, Remind and Bloomz. These relationships help ensure students' academic success.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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