Pinecrest Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pinecrest Elementary School

7950 LITHIA PINECREST RD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Denise Mobley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

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* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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

Pinecrest Elementary School

7950 LITHIA PINECREST RD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

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	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Provide
Instructional
Learning
Opportunities
To
Succeed

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a learning community where everyone achieves success as we prepare students for life.

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
Mobley, Denise	Principal	Administration
Cook, Debbie	SAC Member	SAC Chairperson
Turner, kellie	Teacher, K-12	Parent Involvement Liaison
	Assistant Principal	Administration

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2011, Denise Mobley

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.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

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%
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* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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.	

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	77	88	74	106	78	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	12	12	5	18	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	9	10	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	69	115	76	88	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	481
Attendance below 90 percent	9	10	5	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	25	34	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
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	1	0	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	61	69	115	76	88	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	481
Attendance below 90 percent	9	10	5	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	25	34	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
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	1	0	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	47%	52%	57%	50%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	55%	58%	55%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	50%	53%	49%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	54%	63%	50%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	57%	62%	66%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	46%	51%	51%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	50%	53%	44%	48%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%	
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	57%	-12%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%	
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	56%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		-7%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%	
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		-5%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%	
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	62%	-25%	
Same Grade Comparison		19%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	43%	57%	-14%	64%	-21%	
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	62%	-19%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		6%					
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%	
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	61%	-8%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		6%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	46%	51%	-5%	53%	-7%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%
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	29	37	29	27	52	46	29				
ELL	19	33	23	26	40	31	24				
HSP	32	43	33	41	51	44	30				
MUL	40			50							
WHT	54	51	57	56	57	41	58				
FRL	42	46	37	42	49	41	40				

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	35	40	37	31	40	29	29				
ELL	33	48	42	33	59	50	10				
HSP	42	46	48	36	55	45	39				
WHT	51	42	42	49	48	33	49				
FRL	41	42	45	37	46	37	41				

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	27	39	43	38	57	23	13				
ELL	25	48	44	33	62	58	23				
HSP	33	53	41	42	64	50	37				
WHT	61	55	58	57	68	48	52				
FRL	40	53	47	42	65	53	37				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	393
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	45
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	53
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	45
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 subject area Pinecrest performed the lowest was in ELA. Forty-seven percent of our 2019 3rd-5th grade learners scored at a level 3 or higher in ELA. In 2018, 50% of our 3rd-5th grade learners scored at a level 3 or higher. This shows a decrease of 3%. In 2019, 41% of our learners exhibited learning gains in the lowest 25th percentile.

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

The greatest decline was with our bottom quartile in ELA. In 2019, 41% of 3rd retainees, 4th and 5th grade learners in the bottom quartile demonstrated learning gains in ELA which was a 7% decline from 2018. In 2018, 48% of 3rd retainees, 4th, and 5th grades demonstrated learning gains in ELA. With decrease Title I funding, we were unable to purchase day time tutors used in the past to support our Flight School/MTSS instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

In comparing our school data to the state's, the data shows the greatest gaps are in the areas of math proficiency and bottom quartile learning gains in ELA. In 2019, 51% of Pinecrest 3rd-5th grade learners scored a level 3 or higher on the Math FSA which is a 12%gap from the state's 63%. In ELA, 41% of our lowest quartile students showed learning gains which is a 12% gap from the state average of 53%.

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

In review of our data, Pinecrest learners showed the most improvement in our Math proficiency. Our math proficiency increased from 44% in 2018 to 51% in 2019.

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

Early warning sign data illustrates a need to focus on our bottom quartile learners.

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

1. ELA Bottom Quartile
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Math Bottom Quartile
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Pinecrest will focus on strengthening our core Instructional practices especially related to Differentiation in ELA to better meet the needs of our diverse student population with an emphasis on our bottom quartile students. In review of our 2019 FSA data, although our overall ELA gains increased by 3%; our bottom quartile decreased by 7%. in addition, we had two subgroups (SLD and ELL) that were below 41% based on the Federal Index for reading.
Measurable Outcome:	By Spring 2021, our overall reading proficiency will increase by 3% and our lowest 25% of students in reading will make a 3% increase in their learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Incorporate individualized targeted foundational skill lessons within the guided reading block. Provide researched based intervention supports and materials to assist teachers with differentiation and addressing gaps in learning. Provide coaching cycles with Reading Coach to strengthen core instruction, differentiation in guided reading, implementation of foundational skill lessons, and MTSS intervention supports.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By implementing research based intensive interventions with fidelity we will provide our students with the academic gains needed to be successful. Research supports the use of a reading coach to assist teachers in implementation of reading strategies to foster teacher knowledge, familiarity of materials, and us of best practices to strengthen core instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide common standard based planning time for each grade level to collaboratively plan based on the state standards and target foundations skills.
2. Conduct Individual data chats to ensure teachers analyze individual student data to identify instructional small groups based on student needs. Use this information to conduct data sorts to allow grade levels to create targeted skill groups and plan for differentiated interventions groups based on identified needs.
3. Provide Coaching Cycles for each teacher including best practices for guided reading.
4. Assign grade level MTSS liaison to support each grade level with support and resources needed to provide targeted differentiation for all tiered students.
5. Provide professional development on ELA best practices. methods, and/or strategies.
6. Provide tutoring support for small group instruction.
7. Provide parent engagement activities to provide parents with ELA strategies to use at home.
8. Utilize additional technology to enhance and increase iReady usage.

Person Responsible	Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Pinecrest will focus on increasing learning gains with our bottom quartile in Math.This learners display gaps in basic math concepts and skills causing them to struggle with multi-step problems. Although our math learning gains for the lowest 25% learners increase by 3%, we still have room to grow to close the achievement gap.
Measurable Outcome:	By Spring 2021, our lowest 25% of learners in math will show a 3% increase in learning gains as measured by the Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standard based planning using math contact teachers as resources for teachers during planning session as well as grade level conceptional unit planning including SMP's, guided math lessons. Provide either day time or afterschool tutoring to help fill learners' conceptional gaps. Continue to strengthen core math instruction through various professional developments. If funds allow, purchase additional supplemental materials to small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the research report by Brookings Institute, "New Evidence on the Benefits of Small Group Math Instruction for Young Children" and Networks on-line journal for Teacher Research report "The Effects of Flexible Small Groups on Math Achievement" supports that when students are provided with consistent core instruction along with additional small differentiated guided math groups, they make meaningful learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide common standard based planning time for each grade level to collaboratively plan based on the state standards and SMP.
2. Conduct Individual data chats to ensure teachers analyze individual student data to identify instructional small groups based on student needs. Use this information to plan for differentiated interventions groups based on identified math needs.
3. Assign grade level MTSS liaison to support each grade level with support and resources needed to provide targeted differentiation for all tiered students.
4. Provide professional development on mathematical best practices. methods, and/or strategies.
5. Provide tutoring support for small group instruction.
6. Provide parent engagement activities to provide parents with Math strategies to use at home.
7. Utilize additional technology to enhance and increase iReady usage.

Person Responsible	Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Create a collaborative culture of standard base planning in order to strengthen our core instruction and develop strategies for differentiation.

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.

The school promotes a positive culture for parents to participate in PTA. family engagement activities, and as parents volunteers. Daytime and evening parent opportunities are made available to parents for their convenience. Clear and frequent communication through agenda planners, website, parentlink, twitter and facebook are utilized. We collaborate with SEEDS of Hope to provide a backpack program for need families to have food over the weekend.

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				$132,187.04
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3362 - Pinecrest Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$81,187.04
			Notes: Notes: Reading Coach			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3362 - Pinecrest Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.0	$30,000.00
			Notes: 2 Day Time Title I Tutors			
	3336	500-Materials and Supplies	3362 - Pinecrest Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
			Notes: Purchase additional instructional materials such as guided reading materials, classroom libraries, assessment toolkits, and/or math manipulative to support intensive small group instruction impacting K-5 students identified in the bottom quartile or Federal Index/ ESSA subgroups.			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3362 - Pinecrest Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$4,000.00
			Notes: Teacher trainings and job imbedded Professional Development			

	6500	649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	3362 - Pinecrest Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$10,000.00
	6150	500-Materials and Supplies	3362 - Pinecrest Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00
			Notes: As mandated by ESSA Section 1116 meaningful activities will be conducted to provide the communication and support necessary to assist and build the capacity of all families and staff in planning and implementing effective parent and family involvement activities to improve student academic achievement and school performance. Please refer to the Parent & Family Engagement Plan for specific details. PFE allocation: $2,000.00			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$132,187.04**