

Broward County Public Schools

Pines Lakes 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Pines Lakes Elementary School

10300 JOHNSON ST, Pembroke Pines, FL 33026

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Susan Sasse

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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	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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: D (37%)
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	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 Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Pines Lakes Elementary School

10300 JOHNSON ST, Pembroke Pines, FL 33026

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">69%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">90%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Preparing the next generation to be problem solvers and innovative thinkers through S.T.E.M. project based learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pines Lakes Elementary is committed to providing a happy, caring and stimulating environment where children will recognize and achieve their fullest potential.

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
Sasse, Susan	Principal	To provide the leadership and management necessary to administer and supervise all programs, policies and activities of Pines Lakes Elementary (PLE) to ensure high quality educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment. Monitor student performance and teacher instructional practice, analyze data trends, and along with instructional coaches, provide support for teachers.
Dejean, Christina	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for implementing and facilitating strategies and materials to meet the needs of all students as part of the School Improvement Plan. Also serve on subcommittees such as Grade Level Chairs, Community Events and SAC/SAF.
Creviston, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Provide guidance and support for teachers in the area of English Language Arts (ELA), collaborate appropriate professional development and PLC support. Instructional Coach provides personalized support that is based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition to strategic content focused mentoring, coach supports teachers to develop skills in critical areas such as establishing positive classroom culture and climate, implementing instructional strategies, analyzing student work, differentiating instruction and supporting English Language Learners and student with special needs. Also, coaches will work collaboratively, build skills, analyze data, examine needs related to professional practice and engage in peer coaching with teachers.
Wolfe-Yoloye, Carlene	School Counselor	Help students process their problems and plan goals and action. Mediate conflict between students and teachers to ensure that they can meet their academic goals.
Taber, Andrea	Other	ESE Specialist - provides support to school to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or Access curriculum, statewide assessments, and accountability systems. Support teachers in tracking students' data to make appropriate instructional decisions. The ESE Specialist provides personalized support based on identified needs of individuals based on differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers.
Funk, Laura	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Coach - Provide guidance and support for teachers in the area of Math and Science, collaborate appropriate professional development and PLC support. Instructional Coach provides personalized support that is based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition to strategic content focused mentoring, coach supports teachers to develop skills in critical areas such as establishing

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		positive classroom culture and climate, implementing instructional strategies, analyzing student work, differentiating instruction and supporting English Language Learners and student with special needs. Also, coaches will work collaboratively, build skills, analyze data, examine needs related to professional practice and engage in peer coaching with teachers.
Balroop, Amrita	Assistant Principal	Monitor student performance and teacher instructional practice, analyze data trends, and along with the Literacy coach, provide support for teachers. Shares current educational trends, research and technology; understands the unique needs, population trends and characteristics of the students served at PLE; demonstrate effective communication and interaction skills with all stakeholders and track accountability.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Susan Sasse

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.*

22

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%

<p>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students</p>
<p>School Grades History</p>	<p>2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: D (37%)</p>
<p>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</p>	
<p>SI Region</p>	<p>Southeast</p>
<p>Regional Executive Director</p>	<p>LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</p>
<p>Turnaround Option/Cycle</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Year</p>	
<p>Support Tier</p>	
<p>ESSA Status</p>	<p>TS&I</p>
<p>* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.</p>	

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	73	83	73	69	79	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	457
Attendance below 90 percent	25	18	16	14	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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

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	2	0	0	14	6	3	0	0	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	3	1	10	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	84	77	81	82	73	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	26	21	18	17	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

One or more suspensions	2	1	1	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	39	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	2	0	0	17	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	4	2	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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

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	84	77	81	82	73	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	26	21	18	17	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	39	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	2	0	0	17	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	4	2	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	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	54%	59%	57%	50%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	60%	58%	66%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	54%	53%	58%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	65%	63%	51%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	66%	62%	64%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	53%	51%	55%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	46%	53%	44%	45%	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	44%	60%	-16%	58%	-14%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	62%	-5%	58%	-1%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	49%	59%	-10%	56%	-7%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	40%	65%	-25%	62%	-22%
	2018	36%	63%	-27%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	67%	-6%	64%	-3%
	2018	59%	63%	-4%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
05	2019	72%	64%	8%	60%	12%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	49%	3%	53%	-1%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	36		30	70	58	29				
ELL	53	48	44	65	81	73	59				
BLK	51	53	27	65	83	64	48				
HSP	52	53	45	57	76	67	64				
WHT	79	64		63	86						
FRL	50	48	39	57	78	66	54				
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	34	38	27	34	63	58	40				
ELL	39	51	50	45	67	69					
BLK	51	52	41	48	65	53	48				
HSP	54	62	56	57	69	60	58				
WHT	65	56		65	75						
FRL	51	57	46	51	67	57	55				
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	10	64	75	23	50	67	17				
ELL	44	75	64	28	46	42					
BLK	38	64	57	48	64	60	25				
HSP	56	69	71	50	62	50	50				
WHT	60	58		59	61		83				
FRL	48	64	54	50	65	62	41				

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	59
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	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	
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	56
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	59
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	
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	73
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	58
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 that showed the lowest performance was Students with Disabilities in ELA and Math. Students with disabilities showed only 30% achieved proficiency on the ELA and Math portions of the Florida Standards Assessment in 2019.

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

Pines Lakes Elementary's ELA scores showed a greater decline due to the focus being heavily on Math. The contributing factor was an intense focus for professional learning on the new math textbook adoption materials for Broward School District permitting less time to spend on ELA.

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.

Pines Lakes Elementary's greatest gap was ELA Lowest Percentile: State was at 53 compared to Pines Lakes at 39. As mentioned above the contributing factor the intense focus on Math versus an equal focus on all subject areas.

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

The component that exhibited the most improvement was Math. This was due to the extensive work done throughout Professional Learning Communities to ensure teacher professional learning and improvement.

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

Reflecting on the Early Warning Systems (EWS), Kindergarten attendance is our highest area of concern.

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

1. ELA Focused Professional Learning Communities
2. Scaling up the RTI Process
3. Early identification/interventions in place for students with reading deficiencies

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At Pines Lakes Elementary students' ELA proficiency scores have decreased from the previous year's Spring FSA results; this Area of Focus will increase student achievement and student success.
Measurable Outcome:	At Pines Lakes Elementary the By Spring 2021 Pines Lakes Elementary will achieve 56% Proficiency in ELA based on the FSA results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Sasse (susan.sasse@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Pines Lakes Elementary will use the following Evidenced Based Strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher led instruction through iReady lessons 2. Foundations Reading Intervention 3. Phonics for Reading from Curriculum Associates
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All of the evidenced based strategies listed above have been chosen since they provide us with critical progress monitoring tools and resources to tailor instruction to individual student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

- Determine student needs through initial diagnostic assessments
 - 2. Analyze student data to determine student progress and goals
 - 3. Create individual student goals for all students
 - 4. Ensure teacher instructional plan is aligned to student goals
 - 5. Continue to progress monitor throughout the school year
- Person Responsible** Susan Sasse (susan.sasse@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At Pines Lakes Elementary students with disabilities have not shown adequate progress for meeting the ESSA FPPI requirement of 41% or higher. By focusing on this subgroup students will meet the ESSA requirement and increase student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	At Pines Lakes Elementary the subgroup of Students With Disabilities will increase their ELA learning gains in by 11% as evidenced by the Spring 2021 FSA assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Sasse (susan.sasse@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Pines Lakes Elementary will use the following teaching 1. Teacher led instruction through targeted iReady lessons 2. Foundations Reading Intervention 3. Phonics for Reading from Curriculum Associates
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All of the evidenced based strategies listed above have been chosen since they provide us with critical progress monitoring tools and resources to tailor instruction for individual student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Determine student needs through initial diagnostic assessments and IEP Goals
2. Analyze student data to determine student progress and goals
3. Create individual student goals for all students with disabilities
4. Ensure teacher instructional plan is aligned to student goals
5. Continue to progress monitor throughout the school year

Person Responsible Susan Sasse (susan.sasse@browardschools.com)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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.

School Safety - School Safety continues to be an area of improvement for our school. We continue to ensure school safety through an enhancement to the single point of entry with pedestrian gates as well as a school Campus Monitor.

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.

Parents will be invited and encouraged to become active members of the School Advisory Council (SAC). At the monthly SAC meetings, parents will be provided information regarding the school’s “Title I” budget allocation, including professional development and parent involvement funds.

Parents will be encouraged and allowed to provide input into the decision-making process of all “Title I” activities related to the school and the development of “Title I” documents. An annual evaluation will be conducted using surveys completed by parents, staff, and students. Results will be analyzed to evaluate the effectiveness of the school’s “Title I” Parent Involvement Plan.

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: ELA				\$10,704.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			2861 - Pines Lakes Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$10,704.00
			<i>Notes: Title I, Part E Teacher use of iReady materials for small group instruction.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:				\$0.00

	Total: \$10,704.00
--	---------------------------