

Martin County School District

# Pinewood Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Pinewood Elementary School

5200 SE WILLOUGHBY BLVD, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/pes

## Demographics

Principal: Susanna Deutsch

Start Date for this Principal: 5/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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 Martin 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](http://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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

## Pinewood Elementary School

5200 SE WILLOUGHBY BLVD, Stuart, FL 34997

[martinschools.org/o/pes](http://martinschools.org/o/pes)

### 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 KG-5	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

### 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 Martin 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.

The mission of Pinewood Elementary School is to Educate All Students for Success.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Pinewood Elementary School is to build a Dynamic Educational System of Success.

### 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
Radcliff, Jennifer	Principal	Increase student proficiency through quality staff development and use of instructional materials.
Morris, Patty	Assistant Principal	
Morrell, Aimee	Assistant Principal	
Mannion, Maureen	Instructional Coach	
Davis, Lori		
Grauer, Crystal	Instructional Coach	Coach teachers and students

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 5/1/2016, Susanna Deutsch

**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.*

4

**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.*

4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

41

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	112	124	119	122	146	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	742
Attendance below 90 percent	22	36	16	22	27	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	12	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

#### 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	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/15/2020

#### 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	124	120	123	154	122	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	24	15	26	14	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	3	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	42	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

#### 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	20	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	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	124	120	123	154	122	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	24	15	26	14	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	3	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	42	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

**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	20	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	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	48%	58%	57%	52%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	59%	58%	63%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	56%	53%	58%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	65%	63%	64%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	73%	65%	62%	66%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	53%	51%	63%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	58%	53%	40%	55%	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	41%	54%	-13%	58%	-17%
	2018	49%	57%	-8%	57%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	57%	-6%	58%	-7%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	47%	55%	-8%	56%	-9%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	32%	58%	-26%	62%	-30%
	2018	56%	63%	-7%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	67%	6%	64%	9%
	2018	65%	64%	1%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	68%	64%	4%	60%	8%
	2018	64%	64%	0%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	56%	54%	2%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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	49	47	37	58	53	25				
ELL	26	52	64	42	69	62	18				
ASN	58	60		83	80						
BLK	44	65		47	76						
HSP	38	58	60	48	71	60	36				
MUL	50	80		58	73						
WHT	58	59	58	75	73	59	58				
FRL	35	56	65	48	70	58	38				
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	50	57	43	53	31	27				
ELL	32	54	50	37	47	38	26				
ASN	69			92							
BLK	68	50		64	39						
HSP	41	61	57	46	49	38	32				
MUL	52	53		58	67						
WHT	62	54	77	78	68	50	78				
FRL	53	57	60	63	58	37	58				
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	12	43	58	31	47	53	11				
ELL	19	45	53	42	61	61	28				
ASN	62			92							
BLK	72	93		60	64						
HSP	38	61	59	52	61	60	33				
MUL	53	45		60	82						
WHT	61	61	43	74	68	57	45				
FRL	45	58	56	56	59	56	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	48
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	70
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	58
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	53

Hispanic Students	
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	65
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	63
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	52
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 components that showed the lowest performance were ELA and Science proficiency. Contributing factors include students' difficulty with reading and comprehending grade level complex text.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline is science proficiency. Contributing factors include students' difficulty with reading and comprehending grade level complex text.

**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.**

The data component having the greatest gap when compared to state average is Science proficiency. Contributing factors include students' difficulty with reading and comprehending grade level complex text.

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

The most improved data component is learning gains in the lowest quartile in math. Students in the lowest quartile showed a 23 percentage point increase due to increased focus and monitoring of differentiation during the math workshop.

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

EWS data indicates a concern with students scoring a level on on FSA ELA and math assessments. 24% of students scored level 1 on ELA and math on the prior prior year assessments.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Science proficiency
3. ESE student learning gains and proficiency in ELA
4. ESE student learning gains and proficiency in math
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus</b> <b>Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>48% of students in grades 3-5 scored levels 3 and above on the 2019 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.</p> <p>60% of our students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 demonstrated a learning gain on the 2019 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.</p> <p>20% of our students in the ESE subgroup and 25% of our students in the ELL subgroup in grades 3-5 scored levels 3 and above on the 2019 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.</p> <p>31% of our students in grade 3 scored on or above level on iReady Diagnostic 1 as opposed to 47% last year.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 48% to 52% on the 2020-2021 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.</p> <p>The percentage of students in the lowest quartile demonstrating a learning gain in grades 3-5 will increase from 63% to 68% on the 2020-2021 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.</p> <p>The percentage of students in the ESE and ELL subgroups in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 20% to 30% and 25%-35% respectively on the 2020-2021 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.</p> <p>The percentage of students in grade 3 scoring on or above level on iReady Diagnostic 3 will increase from 31% to 75% in ELA.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Crystal Grauer (grauerc@martinschools.org)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implementation of Monitoring, Tracking, Data collection for Proficiency during ELA instruction</li> <li>2. Small Group Differentiated Instruction</li> <li>3. Word Study and Phonics/ Phonological Awareness Curriculum across grade levels</li> <li>4. Coaching cycles for standards based instruction to build the literacy block</li> <li>5. Providing phonics instruction at the core for all third grade students.</li> </ol> <p>1. Monitoring, tracking, and data collection will help facilitate whole group instruction and remediation/enrichment of small group instruction.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>2. We selected small group differentiated instruction because we want to use individual student data to develop individualized student plans for instruction. We want to focus on guided reading, strategy lesson, and conferring with readers and writers.</p> <p>3. Student data shows a deficit in phonological awareness and phonics, and we are addressing this with Heggerty phonological awareness for K-1, Wilson Foundations for K-2, and Words their Way for 3-5. Some students that need intensive remediation in grades 3-5 are using Phonics for Reading.</p>



4. We know using coaching cycles is an effective strategy because we want to coach teachers to teach to the rigor of the standards and to be proficient in delivery of instruction.
5. 65% of third grade students were below grade level in phonics.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Coaches will provide modeling, PLC planning times, coaching, and one on one planning sessions to develop teachers and the use of formative and summative assessments. This can include artifacts such as; running records, reader's notebooks, checklists, iReady results, pre and post assessments, PAST and PHONICS assessments, Foundations assessments, conferencing notes, Bear Spelling Inventory, and more.

**Person Responsible** Andrea Ascianto-Houck (asciuta@martin.k12.fl.us)

2. Coaches will provide modeling, coaching, PLC planning times, and one on one planning sessions to develop strategy lessons, guided reading, and reading/writing conferences within the ELA classroom. Professional development will be provided based on teacher and student data.

**Person Responsible** Andrea Ascianto-Houck (asciuta@martin.k12.fl.us)

3. Foundations will be implemented in K-2 to support achievement in phonics, word study, high frequency word study, vocabulary, handwriting, spelling, and fluency. K-1 will use Heggerty phonological awareness program to support early literacy needs. Grades 3-5 will implement Words Their Way, a differentiated word study curriculum. Coaches will support teachers in implementing and analyzing data in respect to these programs.

**Person Responsible** Maureen Mannion (manniom@martin.k12.fl.us)

4. Supporting English Language Learners is important to our school and closing gaps. Coaches will work to provide multiple learning opportunities around supporting our ELL students. Teachers will receive training around understanding and using our WIDA ACCESS data to support students in efforts to teach them at their zone of proximal development.

**Person Responsible** Andrea Ascianto-Houck (asciuta@martin.k12.fl.us)

5. Differentiated training and coaching cycles will be implemented to support the growth of teachers new to Pinewood in mini lesson, matching readers to books, balanced literacy, as well as those mentioned above.

**Person Responsible** Maureen Mannion (manniom@martin.k12.fl.us)

6. Within the master schedule, K-2 ELA has been extended to focus on foundational developmental reading skills.

**Person Responsible** Maureen Mannion (manniom@martin.k12.fl.us)

7. Implementation of Phonics for Reading 5 days a week for 12-16 weeks is expected to decrease achievement gaps by increasing phonics proficiency.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

61% of students in grades 3-5 scored in levels 3 and above on the 2019 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

59% of our students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 demonstrated a learning gain on the 2019 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math.

25% of our students in the ESE subgroup and 38% of our students in the ELL subgroup scored in levels 3 and above on the 2019 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math.

11% of our students score on or above level on iReady diagnostic 1 for math as opposed to 17% last year.

The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above on the 2020-2021 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math will increase from 61% to 65%.

The percentage of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 will increase from 59% to 64% on the 2020 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The percentage of students in the ESE and ELL subgroups in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above on the 2020-2021 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math will increase from 25% to 35% and 38%-48% respectively.

The percentage of students in grade 3 scoring on or above level on iReady Diagnostic 3 will increase from 11% to 65% in Math.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Maureen Mannion (manniom@martin.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Implementation of monitoring and tracking proficiency during math instruction.
2. Use of small group differentiation based on data for remediation and enrichment.
3. Coaching cycles for standard based instruction to build the math block.
4. Teachers will use Number Talks during the math workshop.
5. Use of additional resources such as MAFs for student use and Math in Practice as a teacher resource.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Monitoring, tracking progress, and data analysis will help facilitate both remediation and enrichment of small group instruction.
2. We selected small group differentiated instruction because we want to use individual student data to develop individualized student plans for instruction. We want to focus on strategy lessons and conferring with students.
3. We know using coaching cycles is an effective strategy because we want to coach teachers to teach to the rigor of the standards and to be proficient in delivery of instruction.
4. Through daily exposure of mental math strategies through Number Talks that focus on number sense and fluency, students' achievement in these areas will increase.
5. The MAFs student edition provides additional practice for standards based math instruction that matches the rigor of the statewide assessment. Math in Practice helps teachers plan explicit standards based lessons utilizing various strategies and developing a deeper understanding of mathematical practice.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Coaches will provide modeling, PLC planning times, coaching, and one on one planning sessions to develop teachers and the use of formative and summative assessments. This can include artifacts such as; checklists, iReady results, pre and post assessments, conferencing notes, exit tickets, and more.

**Person Responsible** Maureen Mannion (manniom@martin.k12.fl.us)

2. Coaches will provide modeling, coaching, PLC planning times, and one on one planning sessions to develop strategy lessons, Number Talks, mini lessons, and math conferences within the math classroom. Professional development will be provided based on teacher and student data.

**Person Responsible** Maureen Mannion (manniom@martin.k12.fl.us)

3. Differentiated training and coaching cycles will be implemented to support the growth of teachers new to Pinewood in mini lesson, Number Talks, and differentiated instruction as well as those mentioned above.

**Person Responsible** Maureen Mannion (manniom@martin.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

48% of students in grade 5 scored a level 3 or higher on the 2019 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The percentage of students in grade 5 scoring level 3 or above will increase from 48% to 53% on the 2020-2021 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Coaches and science lab teacher will support with planning during PLCs and partner teach to increase the rigor of standards based instruction during the science block.
2. Implementation of hands on inquiry lessons to tie in with each standard based unity of study.
3. Integrate science content and nonfiction texts into ELA and math instruction (read alouds, small group, independent reading, writing prompts, etc.).
4. Implement common science vocabulary to use in all grade levels.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

When looking at school data, we saw a drop in our Science scores. We went from 56% proficient to 48% proficient. We also realized that we did not meet district or state overall scores. The district received 53% on or above proficiency, and the state was at 53% on or above proficiency.

1. Planning and partner teaching with teachers is an effective strategy because we want teachers to teach to the rigor of the standards and to feel proficient in delivery of instruction.
2. Hands-on inquiry lessons will continuously expose students to science in order to improve retention of content and vocabulary.
3. Integration of subjects will increase time spent on science content.
4. Daily practice of vocabulary will increase comprehension of science content.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Purposeful planning with teachers during PLCs for effective science instruction and partner teach with teachers to elevate instruction to the rigor of the standard.

**Person Responsible**

Crystal Grauer (grauerc@martinschools.org)

2. A goal has been established for all teachers to implement a hands-on experience for every standards based unit.

**Person Responsible**

Crystal Grauer (grauerc@martinschools.org)

3. Teachers need to integrate science content and nonfiction texts into ELA and Math instruction through mini lessons, small group instruction, and independent practice activities.

**Person Responsible**

Crystal Grauer (grauerc@martinschools.org)

4. Explicitly teach vocabulary from district provided frameworks.

**Person Responsible**

Crystal Grauer (grauerc@martinschools.org)

5. Use science journals to illustrate vocabulary and determine meaning of new words.

**Person Responsible** Crystal Grauer (grauerc@martinschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**See plan**

## 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.

Pinewood kicked off the year with the theme #paws-itivlystrong. Staff was retrained on Restorative Practice which is being implemented in the classrooms and emphasizes the importance of building relationships. Staff was also trained on how to be positive role models for students, the importance of communication with families and the specifics of how communicate well. At curriculum night a parent workshop will engage parents the importance of creating a reading environment in the home and using a growth mindset with their children. If allowable, PWE will hold a literacy night and STEM night in addition to Meet the Teacher, and Curriculum Nights. We will continue celebrating a Student of the Month based on our Character Counts Pillars. In addition, the school will continue to recruit parents to be a part of the PTA and SAC committees in efforts to get their input on school goals and student achievement.

### 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				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	5100		0291 - Pinewood Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Resources to support ELA instruction</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$1,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100		0291 - Pinewood Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: resources to support math instruction</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>				<b>\$1,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100		0291 - Pinewood Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Resources to support science instruction</i>			
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$4,500.00</b>