

Collier County Public Schools

Pine Ridge Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Pine Ridge Middle School

1515 PINE RIDGE RD, Naples, FL 34109

<https://www.collierschools.com/prm>

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Gordon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2020-21 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Collier County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Pine Ridge Middle School

1515 PINE RIDGE RD, Naples, FL 34109

<https://www.collierschools.com/prm>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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.

Our mission is to deliver an excellent education, prepare students for future challenges and opportunities, and empower all learners to achieve and succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will complete school prepared for ongoing learning as well as community and global responsibilities.

P - Prepared

R - Responsible

M - Motivated

S - Safe

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Coloma, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Attendance and Discipline PBIS Focus on Social Studies and Science PLCs
Gordon, Michelle	Principal	Team members meet with the grade level Professional Learning Communities in which Team Leaders conduct problem solving sessions. Leadership team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and analysis. At these meetings student data is discussed, analyzed, and submitted to the appropriate district site. Data driven decisions are made and continuous student improvement is the focus of discussion. Academic as well as behavior data is reviewed. Quarterly data is utilized to monitor specific populations who need to be targeted by progress indicators. Based on data, fidelity of academic and behavioral services delivered is monitored
Garbo, Lauri	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction Language Arts PLCs
Spencer, Brett	Teacher, ESE	Assist in monitoring of all SWD
Vessella, Marisa	Math Coach	Assist with monitoring Math PLCs
Gonder, Scot	Administrative Support	Building safety and security
higgins, jane	Reading Coach	monitoring all language arts PLCs
Gentile, Janet	School Counselor	Student placement SEL concerns
Lindenmeyer, Beth	Instructional Media	Technology support Media circulation

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Michelle Gordon

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.*

9

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

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

897

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	284	342	0	0	0	0	898
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	29	38	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	19	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	32	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	19	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	37	49	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	33	41	0	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	13	24	38	0	0	0	0	75

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/16/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	356	317	0	0	0	0	970
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	9	0	0	0	0	25
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	6	7	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	37	23	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	31	11	0	0	0	0	68

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	3	12	9	0	0	0	0	24

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

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	356	317	0	0	0	0	970	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	9	0	0	0	0	25	
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	6	7	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	0	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	37	23	0	0	0	0	80	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	31	11	0	0	0	0	68	

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	3	12	9	0	0	0	0	24

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				78%	59%	54%	78%	61%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	55%	54%	66%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	45%	47%	51%	50%	47%
Math Achievement				83%	69%	58%	83%	71%	58%
Math Learning Gains				68%	62%	57%	71%	67%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	57%	51%	68%	62%	51%
Science Achievement				75%	55%	51%	73%	60%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				88%	75%	72%	88%	74%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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
06	2021					
	2019	75%	56%	19%	54%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	76%	55%	21%	52%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
08	2021					
	2019	79%	58%	21%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	81%	61%	20%	55%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	81%	66%	15%	54%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
08	2021					
	2019	58%	36%	22%	46%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	74%	52%	22%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	87%	72%	15%	71%	16%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	91%	67%	24%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

PRM will be utilizing district created quarterly benchmark assessments.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(170/242) 70%	(190/269) 71%	(163/258) 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(57/104) 55%	(67/114) 59%	(51/107) 48%
	Students With Disabilities	(12/38) 32%	(15/43) 35%	(9/41) 22%
	English Language Learners	(9/29) 31%	(7/33) 21%	(4/30) 13%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(192/262) 73%	(202/267) 76%	(149/254) 59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(63/108) 58%	(69/113) 61%	(47/107) 44%
	Students With Disabilities	(9/35) 26%	(18/42) 43%	(10/38) 26%
	English Language Learners	(10/40) 25%	(13/33) 39%	(4/31) 13%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(206/315) 65%	(229/321) 71%	(213/264) 81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(67/140) 48%	(77/143) 54%	(74/109) 68%
	Students With Disabilities	(9/35) 26%	(6/34) 18%	(8/33) 24%
	English Language Learners	(10/40) 25%	(15/42) 36%	(10/14) 71%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(238/304) 78%	(257/313) 82%	(191/279) 68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(87/138) 63%	(99/140) 71%	(58/122) 48%
	Students With Disabilities	(15/35) 43%	(16/33) 48%	(6/33) 18%
	English Language Learners	(18/40) 45%	(22/42) 52%	(10/33) 30%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(236/316) 75%	(249/317) 79%	(247/308) 80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(84/140) 60%	(93/142) 65%	(94/138) 68%
	Students With Disabilities	(12/33) 36%	(12/33) 36%	(11/33) 33%
	English Language Learners	(17/42) 40%	(17/42) 40%	(18/37) 49%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(191/279) 68%	(222/282) 79%	(191/273) 70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(77/128) 60%	(88/129) 68%	(71/120) 59%
	Students With Disabilities	(12/25) 48%	(14/25) 56%	(9/22) 41%
	English Language Learners	(5/23) 22%	(6/25) 24%	(2/24) 8%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(193/271) 71%	(200/276) 72%	(202/260) 78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(77/125) 62%	(77/127) 61%	(80/116) 69%
	Students With Disabilities	(11/23) 48%	(11/24) 46%	(12/24) 50%
	English Language Learners	(7/23) 30%	(10/25) 40%	(15/24) 63%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	(186/276) 67%	(201/281) 72%	(200/275) 73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(70/126) 56%	(75/128) 59%	(73/122) 60%
	Students With Disabilities	(6/23) 26%	(9/24) 38%	(11/25) 44%
	English Language Learners	(5/23) 22%	(6/25) 24%	(6/25) 24%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	27	39	29	28	39	36	19	28	63		
ELL	40	51	45	51	58	51	25	51	77		
ASN	71	67		88	79		50		100		
BLK	40	38		40	25	17	45				
HSP	60	59	47	65	62	51	55	65	93		
MUL	71	50		75	59						
WHT	80	65	35	83	69	47	73	90	89		
FRL	56	52	36	61	52	43	53	65	87		
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	42	53	51	50	52	49	42	59	86		
ELL	46	50	50	68	65	70	48	59	89		

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
ASN	85	58		95	74		93	91	100		
BLK	59	56	53	66	58	61	50	60	90		
HSP	63	59	54	75	62	64	56	78	91		
MUL	88	76		92	76			100			
WHT	86	67	59	87	71	60	85	93	93		
FRL	67	57	53	75	63	63	60	79	86		
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	32	34	34	47	51	55	30	66	62		
ELL	38	53	42	57	64	64	33	69			
ASN	90	76		95	89		86	100	92		
BLK	50	52	53	62	71	78	44		73		
HSP	61	58	46	73	67	63	61	77	87		
MUL	81	74		94	80		88		100		
WHT	87	70	58	87	72	70	80	92	86		
FRL	65	57	49	74	67	67	63	79	83		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	654
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

FSA SY19 to FSA SY21:

ELA - The number of students who scored Level 1 or 2 increased in grade 6, grade 8, and ESE subgroup. The number of students who scored Level 4 or 5 decreased in all grades.

Math - The number of students who scored Level 1 or 2 increased (13% Grade 6; 2% Grade 7; 22% Grade 8)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students in the Lowest 25% Making Gains in both Reading and Math showed the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing Factors: Virtual Learning during SY21, new 7th grade intensive math teacher, two long-term substitute teachers in ELA, ESE Inclusion teacher support schedule.

New Actions: greater frequency of progress monitoring, lessons and instruction targeted to specific standards and subskills, support from a 0.5 Math Coach, adjustments to master schedule to strategically placed ESE students and their inclusion support teachers.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Algebra 1 - Students who earned a Level 4 or 5 increased by 6% from FSA FY19 to FSA FY21.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Contributing Factors: EOC Review and Saturday "Boot Camp", teacher course assignments, adherence to the District pacing guide

New Actions: Use of District Math Coordinator for data analysis and professional development, student course placement, Grade-Level and Subject-Area PLCs.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Acceleration Strategies/ Math: Use of common assessments, increased progress monitoring through ALEKs, use of Reveal resources, and increased ESE support in Algebra 1A/1B.

Acceleration Strategies/ELA: Lessons and instruction targeted to specific standards and subskills, use of District's Writing Instructional Tools, Grade-Level and Subject-Area PLCs.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Development: Targeted workshop sessions on early release and professional development days (Increasing Rigor with Complex Questioning, etc.), Department PLC meetings that include higher-order thinking strategies: examining reasoning, similarities/differences, revising knowledge, and collaborative learning models.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Strategically design and realign Master Schedule to provide support for ESE and ELL populations. Standards-based lessons and grading in all subject areas, with greater monitoring of core subjects. Data binders maintained by teachers and reviewed by the administration team to ensure student data is being analyzed, reviewed, and acted upon. Transportation for after-school learning support to provide equity for all students in need of additional support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our students scoring in the lowest 25% who made learning gains dropped 14% from FY19 to FY21. A lack of additional supports for students based on human resources as well as a loss of instructional focus were contributing factors in this decline. New strategies and instructional models were additional contributing factors.

Measurable Outcome: Students scoring in the lowest 25% who make learning gains will increase by 3% in the subject area of math by May of 2022 as measured by the FSA math scores.

Progress toward this goal will be monitored in the following ways:

- Monitoring:**
1. Administrators will review teachers' classroom binders and note data records which have been recorded.
 2. Teachers will monitor student data and provide interventions as needed to ensure that standards are being achieved.
 3. Subgroups of students (ESE and ELL) have been strategically scheduled to ensure maximum support from ESE inclusion teachers.
 4. Administrators will review lesson plans to ensure that they are: standards-based, paced according to district expectations, and include district-approved resources and materials.
 5. The MTSS process will be used to provide intervention and monitor students' progress
 6. Members of the Senior Leadership Team will attend grade-level PLCs to support teachers who are working in collaboration to plan lessons, develop common assessments, review data, and reflect on the effectiveness of projects and lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Gordon (gordonmi@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Data chats with the math team to provide updates, share concerns, and create action plans
2. Use formative assessment, analysis, and intervention to frequently monitor students' skills and understanding
3. Provide clear Learning Goals & Scales for students to track progress
4. Use spiral review to allow for repeated practice over time
5. Provide for peer collaboration to reinforce concepts and provide meaningful math dialogue
6. Employ scaffolding and differentiation techniques to ensure student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Student achievement has been proven to increase when they are provided with timely feedback, clear goals, individualized data, purposeful grouping, and adaptations (scaffolding and differentiation) that target specific learning needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Data chats - Individual and grade-level, monthly, to monitor student progress and provide student intervention as needed.

Person Responsible

Michelle Gordon (gordonmi@collierschools.com)

Formative Assessment Strategies - Math Coach and Department Chairperson will provide professional development related to the types of and use of formative assessment strategies.

Person Responsible Marisa Vessella (vessem@collierschools.com)

Use of Learning Goals and Scales - Math Coach and Department Chairperson will provide professional development related to teacher and student use of Learning Goals/Scales to track student progress.

Person Responsible Marisa Vessella (vessem@collierschools.com)

Scaffolding and Differentiation Strategies - Math Coach and Department Chairperson will provide professional development related to the types of and use of scaffolding/differentiation strategies. ESE Inclusion teachers and ELL tutor will implement these strategies in small group and individual settings.

Person Responsible Brett Spencer (spencebr@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Students with Disabilities scoring who made learning gains dropped 23% from FY19 to FY21. A lack of additional supports for students based on human resources as well as a loss of instructional focus were contributing factors in this decline. New strategies and instructional models were additional contributing factors.

Measurable Outcome: Students with Disabilities (SWD) who make learning gains will increase by 3% in the subject area of language arts by May 2022 as measured by the FSA ELA scores.

Progress toward this goal will be monitored in the following ways:

1. Administrators will review teachers' classroom binders and note data records which have been recorded.
2. Teachers will monitor student data and provide interventions as needed, including MTSS, to ensure that standards are being achieved.
3. Subgroups of students (ESE and ELL) have been strategically scheduled to ensure maximum support from ESE inclusion teachers.
4. Administrators will review lesson plans to ensure that they are: standards-based, paced according to district expectations, and include district-approved resources and materials.
5. The MTSS process will be used to provide intervention and monitor students' progress
6. Members of the Senior Leadership Team will attend grade-level PLCs to support teachers who are working in collaboration to plan lessons, develop common assessments, review data, and reflect on the effectiveness of projects and lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Data chats with the language arts team to provide updates, share concerns, and create action plans
2. Use formative assessment, analysis, and intervention to frequently monitor students' skills and understanding
3. Provide clear Learning Goals & Scales for students to track progress
4. Use spiral review to allow for repeated practice over time
5. Provide for peer collaboration to reinforce concepts and provide meaningful discussions and dialogue related to literacy standards.
6. Employ scaffolding and differentiation techniques to ensure student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Student achievement has been proven to increase when they are provided with timely feedback, clear goals, individualized data, purposeful grouping, and adaptations (scaffolding and differentiation) that target specific learning needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Data Chats - Individual and grade-level, monthly, to monitor student progress and provide individual intervention as needed.

Person Responsible Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Formative Assessment Strategies - Literacy coach and department chairperson will provide professional development related to the types of and use of formative assessment strategies.

Person Responsible Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Regular Use of Learning Goals & Scales -Literacy coach and department chairperson will provide professional development related to the types of and use of Learning Goals/Scales.

Person Responsible Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Scaffolding & Differentiation Strategies - Literacy coach and department chairperson will provide professional development related to the types of and use of scaffolding and differentiation strategies. ESE Inclusion teachers and ELL tutor will implement strategies in small group and individual settings.

Person Responsible Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Technology Translation Support- Teachers will instruct students on using Immersive Reader, _____, _____, and other applications to support instruction and learning for ELL students.

Person Responsible Brett Spencer (spencebr@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: We experienced a 7% drop with our students who scored a Level 4 or 5 in Math and Language Arts.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring at Level 4 and 5 in math and language arts by 3% by May 2022 as measured by FSA math and language arts scores.

Progress toward this goal will be monitored as follows:

1. Administrators will review teachers' classroom binders and note data records which have been recorded.
2. Teachers will monitor student data and provide interventions as needed to ensure that students are meeting or exceeding proficiency in regard to math and language arts standards.
3. Administrators will review lesson plans to ensure that they are: standards-based, paced according to district expectations, and include district-approved resources and materials.
4. Members of the Senior Leadership Team will attend grade-level PLCs to support teachers who are working in collaboration to plan lessons, create complex questions, develop common assessments, review data, and reflect on the effectiveness of projects and lessons.
5. Language arts lessons will include a variety of complex texts in both fiction and nonfiction.
6. Students will be encouraged to strive toward Level 4 on the Learning Scales in both Math and Language Arts.

Monitoring:**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Michelle Gordon (gordonmi@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Data chats with the language arts and math teams to provide updates, share concerns, and create action plans
2. Use formative assessment, analysis, and intervention to frequently monitor students' skills and understanding
3. Provide clear Learning Goals & Scales for students to track progress toward a Level 4
4. Create enrichment and cognitively complex learning tasks.
5. Provide for peer collaboration to reinforce concepts and provide meaningful discussions and dialogue related to literacy standards and math concepts.
6. Offer access to and support for cognitively complex texts and problem-solving situations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Student achievement has been proven to increase when students are provided with timely feedback, clear goals, individualized data, purposeful grouping, and adaptations (differentiation/enrichment) designed to target specific learning needs and increase motivation.

Action Steps to Implement

Data chats - Individual and grade-level, monthly, to monitor student progress and provide interventions as needed.

Person Responsible

Michelle Gordon (gordonmi@collierschools.com)

Formative Assessment Strategies - Instructional coaches and department chairpersons will provide professional development related to the types of and use of formative assessment strategies.

Person Responsible Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Regular Use of Learning Goals & Scales - Instructional coaches and department chairpersons will provide professional development related to the use of Learning Goals and Scales, which have been provided by the District.

Person Responsible Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Creating enrichment and cognitively complex learning tasks - Instructional coaches and Dr. Garbo will provide professional development related to developing cognitively complex learning tasks and enrichment opportunities so students can transcend the grade-level standards.

Person Responsible Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Provide for peer collaboration - Monitor grade-level PLCs and subject-area planning sessions to ensure discussions include standards-based instructional strategies.

Person Responsible Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

n/a

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.

Pine Ridge Middle School strives to acknowledge the successes of the school and celebrate the unique diversity of the all stakeholders involved. Whether be looking at how each student is scheduled with

purpose; while not only looking at student test scores but strategically scheduled students based on ELL & ESE Eligibility.

Pine Ridge also fosters a positive behavior environment through our school culture. Respect is part of our PBIS Acronym and we fully believe it starts at the top down. Administration must model and show this based on how we treat one another. This is accomplished through regular communications to all stakeholder groups, recognition of the success of students and teachers, and constantly adapting practices based on feedback.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administration & Leadership Team.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00