Pine Ridge Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pine Ridge Elementary School

10245 COUNTY ROAD 561, Clermont, FL 34711

https://pre.lake.k12.fl.us//

Demographics

Principal: Corrie Voytko

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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

Pine Ridge Elementary School

10245 COUNTY ROAD 561, Clermont, FL 34711

https://pre.lake.k12.fl.us//

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	52%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We encourage our children to reach their highest potential through challenging instruction, character education, parent involvement and community support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Pine Ridge Vision is "Striving to personalize instruction to support students as they realize their full potential through active engagement."

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
Obando, Laine	Principal	Maintain campus safety and security, support teachers and students, maintaining high expectations for student achievement, monitor School Improvement plan implementation, communication school goals and focus
Burns, Natasha	Assistant Principal	Maintain campus safety and security, support teachers and students, maintaining high expectations for student achievement, monitor School Improvement plan implementation, communicating school goals and focus

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/1/2016, Corrie Voytko

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.*
43

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
63

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	88	103	112	107	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	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	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	

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	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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	113	141	116	132	132	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	764
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	2	9	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	113	141	116	132	132	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	764
Attendance below 90 percent	13	11	3	5	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	19	13	24	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	2	9	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	74%	58%	57%	70%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	57%	58%	60%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	49%	53%	44%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	60%	63%	77%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	56%	62%	65%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	39%	51%	49%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	54%	53%	53%	49%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey is the table title spanning above.

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	76%	60%	16%	58%	18%
	2018	76%	61%	15%	57%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	60%	15%	58%	17%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	70%	59%	11%	56%	14%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	62%	15%	62%	15%
	2018	74%	65%	9%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	61%	20%	64%	17%
	2018	81%	60%	21%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	78%	57%	21%	60%	18%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	67%	54%	13%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	44	46	43	53	67	50	38				
ELL	61	56	61	73	72	56	36				
BLK	64	58		70	72		50				
HSP	69	70	60	83	74	69	58				
MUL	80			70							
WHT	77	60	49	81	63	43	75				
FRL	64	59	50	67	58	53	57				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	28	17	45	49	41	10				
ELL	55	33		64	58						
ASN	60			70							
BLK	64	59	50	67	61	55	57				
HSP	70	52	31	73	67	40	58				
MUL	73			64							
WHT	73	57	39	81	74	51	72				
FRL	65	55	38	68	65	42	66				

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	32	38	35	43	42	32	17				
ELL	35			65							
BLK	68	65		76	71		54				
HSP	58	54	50	63	50	47	27				
MUL	80			73							
WHT	73	61	43	81	68	47	61				
FRL	64	54	40	71	59	45	49				

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	64
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
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	63
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	69

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	75
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	64
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.

Learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA showed the lowest performance. Overall gains grew from 41% to 52%, however we continue to fall below the state average in this category.

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

5th grade math achievement declined within the cohort by 3% from the previous year. Professional development needs and school goals focused on ELA growth in 2019. This may be a contributing factor to the decline within the cohort.

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.

ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. While performance falls below the state average, we continue to close the gap. Lack of previous systematic phonics instruction may have contributed to the gap.

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

5th grade ELA showed the most improvement, increasing achievement by 8%. Learning gains rose from 57% to 62% and 41% to 52% within the lowest quartile. One new action involved providing daily independent reading time with teacher-led conferring.

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

Attendance rates will be monitored to ensure that students missing 10% or more of school have appropriate supports in place including a plan to support regular attendance. Given the global pandemic, we will continue to support professional development of teachers in relation to the Google Classroom, as it will help serve as a means to keep students connected to instruction throughout the year.

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

1. ELA learning gains for SWD.
2. Math Learning gains for the lowest 25%.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA achievement results show a positive trend, however growth of students in the lowest 25% is an area of focus, particularly as it relates to SWD. Within our district instructional framework, teachers have received professional development connected to independent reading and conferring. We will continue to focus on providing protected time for IDR paired with conferring.
Measurable Outcome:	FSA ELA growth results will show an increase of 4% in all grade levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Daily protected independent reading time with regular teacher-led conferring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the National Council of Teachers of English, "The NCTE Position Statement on Independent Reading is a revision of the previous statement on leisure reading. We believe leisure implies that this reading is solely for entertainment and does not impact long-term reading success. Research supports that independent reading has the most significant impact on student success in reading, but unfortunately it is a practice that is often replaced with other programs and interventions (Lewis & Samuels, 2002)."

Action Steps to Implement

Provide daily, protected independent reading time in schedule.

Person Responsible   Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

iReady professional development to help teachers group students by academic profile in order to support individual needs during conferring.

Person Responsible   Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

Use weekly collaborative planning meetings to discuss student achievement results and determine areas of focus.

Person Responsible   Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

The Literacy Coach will continue to provide professional development to support research-based best practice in ELA, particularly those connected to the work Dr. Angela Schroden led with members of staff last year.

Person Responsible   Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Zones of regulation lessons will be taught to all classes across campus. The Zones is a systematic, cognitive behavioral approach used to teach self-regulation by categorizing all the different ways we feel. This will provide all students with strategies to recognize their emotional state and control those actions that can be associated with certain emotions, and help their overall problem solving.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of implementing school-wide lesson on the Zones of regulation language, there will be an increase in problem solving of peer conflicts amongs students and a reduction of school suspensions by 15%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Zones of regulation is a cognitive behavior approach that categorizes emotions into four color coded zones that helps students better understand their emotions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Being aware of ones emotions and controlling those actions that can result from specific emotions can improve our overall relationship with other. Hattie's meta-analysis, positive peer influences have an effect size of .53 and teacher-student relationships have an effect size of .52.

Action Steps to Implement

During preplanning, an overview of the Zones Regulation approach will be provided to all instructional staff.

Person Responsible	Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)

The Mental Health Liaison and PASS teacher will provide lessons to all classroom across campus during the first nine weeks of school.

Person Responsible	Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)

Guidance, Mental Health Liasion, and PASS teacher will provide supports to teachers, and will follow up with students one on one and in small groups as needed.

Person Responsible	Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data driven remediation and acceleration will be implemented to increase learning gains throughout grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of daily intervention and enrichment, ELA learning gains as measured by FSA will show an increase by 4% across our student population.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Daily intervention focusing on pre-requisite deficiencies identified through diagnostic assessments. Acceleration will be provided to students who show mastery of grade level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on Hattie's meta-analysis, Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29. When students' learning difficulties are identified, corrected and reinforced as early as possible, cognitive gains increase. Following an unprecedented school year that resulted in students completing the final 9 weeks through distance learning, instructional needs differ greatly and must be addressed using intensive focus on data, differentiation, and creativity.

Action Steps to Implement

Scheduled a protected 45 minute Level Up intervention/acceleration block implemented daily to close achievement gaps.

Person Responsible	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

iReady professional development to help teachers group students by academic profile in order to support individual needs.

Person Responsible	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

Use weekly collaborative planning meetings to discuss student achievement results and determine areas of focus.

Person Responsible	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

CRT and Literacy Coach will be included in delivery of interventions.

Person Responsible	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

The Literacy Coach will continue to provide professional development to support research-based best practice in ELA.

Person Responsible	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

Use available funding to provide small group tutoring for 1st - 5th grade students in math and reading. The purpose of this tutoring will be to provide additional opportunities for remediation and support for students.

Person Responsible	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance rates will be monitored by the Guidance department and leadership team to ensure that students missing 10% or more of school have appropriate supports in place including a plan to support regular attendance. Given the global pandemic, we will continue to support professional development of teachers in relation to the Google Classroom, as it will help serve as a means to keep students connected to instruction throughout the year.

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 goal is for all staff members to foster positive relationships with students, among peers, and with each other. Having a consistent, shared vision at Pine Ridge Elementary and sharing that with all stakeholders through SAC and PTO meetings, as well as being posted on our school website is another way we build a positive school culture. Fostering relationships with the all stakeholders through regular communication of both our academic and socio-emotional goals for our school while building school-home connections all year long helps build a positive school culture and environment and ensures all stakeholders are involved.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.