



---

## 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>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</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>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 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%)
<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>	

\* 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

---

<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>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</b>

# Pinewood Elementary School

5200 SE WILLOUGHBY BLVD, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/pes

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">67%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Radcliff, Jennifer	Principal	
Morrell, Aimee	Assistant Principal	
Morris, Patty	Assistant Principal	
Mannion, Maureen	Instructional Coach	
Grauer, Crystal	Instructional Coach	
Muto, Vanessa	School Counselor	
Laing, Gordon	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Armato, Melissa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Heath, Michelle	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Catapano, Adele	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Martin, Ashley	Curriculum Resource Teacher	

### 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.*

7

**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.*

12

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

41

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

753

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

9

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

10

**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	124	132	129	130	160	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	802
Attendance below 90 percent	35	42	26	38	39	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	44	43	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	60	57	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
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	49	47	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

**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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

Wednesday 9/15/2021

**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	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

**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	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

**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				48%	58%	57%	54%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	59%	58%	57%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	56%	53%	60%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	65%	63%	64%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	65%	62%	58%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	53%	51%	36%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	58%	53%	59%	59%	55%

**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
03	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	32%	58%	-26%	62%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	73%	67%	6%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	64%	4%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

During the 2020-2021 school year, we used iReady for progress monitoring in ELA and Math.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23.72	36.31	55.08
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.63	24.90	47.17
	Students With Disabilities	23.19	28.89	42.75
	English Language Learners	9.89	17.83	33.20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15.65	28.01	47.80
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.87	19.86	39.67
	Students With Disabilities	16.06	23.31	35.66
	English Language Learners	4.94	12.94	28.29

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22.58	34.64	51.91
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.42	28.13	45.16
	Students With Disabilities	21.19	31.03	36.04
	English Language Learners	11.11	18.26	31.14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15.2	26.41	43.55
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.92	19.20	35.50
	Students With Disabilities	15.38	22.81	29.36
	English Language Learners	5.13	12.83	25.99
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22.51	34.04	46.82
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.01	27.37	41.24
	Students With Disabilities	15.45	21.82	28.16
	English Language Learners	11.29	16.67	25.10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14.06	22.44	38.46
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.21	15.08	29.80
	Students With Disabilities	12.96	14.95	19.19
	English Language Learners	4.44	10.33	25.32

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22.31	33.08	42.26
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.17	28.74	38.80
	Students With Disabilities	14.49	11.59	17.19
	English Language Learners	11.90	16.87	24.22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13.85	21.61	37.83
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.09	14.68	29.55
	Students With Disabilities	8.82	8.96	16.13
	English Language Learners	4.76	11.66	25.79
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21.80	30.38	36.61
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.20	22.29	29/38
	Students With Disabilities	14.00	12.00	15.91
	English Language Learners	10.91	11.11	17.31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15.91	23.62	40.24
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.47	14.91	29.75
	Students With Disabilities	12.24	12.50	16.67
	English Language Learners	6.36	11.32	24.51
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	18.92	19.47	18.92
	Economically Disadvantaged	8.82	8.70	8.82
	Students With Disabilities	21.05	21.05	21.05
	English Language Learners	8.33	10.00	8.33

**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	21	25		17	13		23				
ELL	23	45	67	27	32	33	15				
ASN	73			100							
BLK	37	31		20	25		33				
HSP	27	47	64	27	27	30	15				
MUL	25			26							
WHT	58	48		51	37		64				
FRL	32	45	68	28	26	33	17				
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				

**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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	331
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	26
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	52
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?**

In both Math and ELA, our ELL population performed lower than any other subgroup.

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

The greatest need for improvement in both ELA and math is integration of ELL strategies.

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

The native language is not English and the instruction is occurring in English. We will increase instruction of content specific vocabulary in subject areas. We will increase parent involvement to educate on how to support learning at home.

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

Our gaps in our subgroup areas in math closed more than those in reading.

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

Increased focus on deliberate planning for instruction in math during the 20-21 school year.

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

Utilize engagement strategies such as white boards and manipulatives during math lessons. Plan for higher order questioning in PLC's to ensure rigorous instruction during lessons. Increased use of number talks in all grade levels to develop mental math fluency.

**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.**

We are utilizing the district math support team for professional development in the use of engagement strategies. We are working with teachers during PLC's on creating higher order questions for use during whole group and small group math lessons

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

Continued use of support personnel as interventionists to build foundational math skills with targeted populations while teachers in classrooms are teaching at a higher level with scaffolding.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

36% of students in grades 3-5 scored in levels 3 and above on the 2021 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math, the remaining 64% of students scored a level 1 or 2.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

31% of our students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 demonstrated a learning gain on the 2021 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math.

17% of our students in the ESE subgroup and 27% of our students in the ELL subgroup scored in levels 3 and above on the 2021 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in math.

46% of our students scored on or above level on the final iReady Math diagnostic during the 2020-2021 school year.

The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math will increase from 36% to 46%, thereby reducing the percentage of students scoring levels 1 or 2 to 54% or below.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The percentage of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 will increase from 31% to 36% on the 2021 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math.

The percentage of students in the ESE and ELL subgroups in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment in Math will increase from 17% to 22% and 27%-32% respectively.

The percentage of students schoolwide (K-5) scoring on or above level on iReady Math Diagnostic 3 will increase from 46% in 2021 to 56% in 2022.

**Monitoring:**

The 2021-2022 administration of the grade 3-5 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in Math is will be how we determine if we have met the minimum desired outcome. We will progress monitor throughout the year using iReady diagnostics, istandards Mastery tests, and district common formative assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Radcliff (radclij@martin.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Use of monitoring and tracking during math instruction.
2. Use of small group differentiation based on data for remediation and enrichment.
3. District math coaches will provide modeling for standards-based instruction.
4. Teachers will use Number Talks during the math workshop.
5. Use of additional resources such as MAFs, iReady Math Teacher Toolbox, and Math in Practice as a teacher resource.
6. Use of engagement strategies and the CRA strategy to promote overall conceptual understanding of mathematical concepts which is especially helpful for ESE and ELL students.
7. All ESE students as well as students who scored level 1 on the administration of the 2021 MATH FSA will participate in additional math instruction with a math interventionist.
8. After school tutoring will be offered to students based on 2021 FSA data as well as the 2021 iReady diagnostic assessment.

9. Increase mathematical discourse by and for all students, especially ESE and ELL, to increase comprehension of strategies and meaning of vocabulary.
  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 will focus on strategy lessons and conferring with students.
  3. We know using coaching cycles is an effective strategy because we want to support teachers in teaching to the rigor of the standards and to be proficient in delivery of instruction.
  4. Through daily exposure to mental math strategies during Number Talks, students' achievement in number sense and fluency will improve.
  5. Use of MAFS and iReady Teacher Toolbox will provide practice that matches the rigor of the statewide assessment.
  6. The use of engagement strategies during math instruction will provide the students with more genuine practice during the math block. Using the CRA strategy will support understanding at the basic level all the way to the abstract level.
  7. Additional instruction for ESE students and students that scored level 1 will allow gaps to be filled while students are still exposed to grade level curriculum,
  8. Tutoring will provide additional time for students to interact with the standards and curriculum.
  9. Mathematical discourse increases student voice, strengthens understanding of strategies and increases rich mathematical understanding of vocabulary.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Coaches will provide modeling, PLC planning support, coaching, and one on one planning sessions to improve teaching practices. Coaches and interventionists will support the use of formative and summative assessments for progress monitoring. This can include artifacts such as checklists, iReady results, pre and post-assessments, conferencing notes, and exit tickets.

**Person Responsible** Aimee Morrell (morrela@martin.k12.fl.us)

2. Coaches will provide modeling, PLC planning support, coaching, and one on one planning sessions to assist teachers in developing strategy lessons, Number Talks, mini-lessons, and math conferences. Professional development will be provided based on teacher and student data.

**Person Responsible** Aimee Morrell (morrela@martin.k12.fl.us)

3. Differentiated training 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** Aimee Morrell (morrela@martin.k12.fl.us)

4. School based math interventionists and tutors will obtain and analyze current data to target specific skill deficits in math. They will use data to group students by need, plan and deliver skill based, differentiated small group instruction in grades 3-5 using a variety of intervention resources such as iReady Math.

**Person Responsible** Gordon Laing (laingg@martinschools.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** 32% of students in grade 5 scored a level 3 or higher on the 2021 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.  
 23% of our students in the ESE subgroup and 15% of our students in the ELL subgroup scored in levels 3 and above on the 2021 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

The percentage of students in grade 5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 32% to 42% on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percentage of students in grade 5 ESE and ELL subgroups scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 23% to 43% and 15% to 30% respectively on the 2021 administration of the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

**Monitoring:** We will progress monitor throughout the year using Science PMTs through Performance Matters, unit tests and district common formative assessments. Instruction will be monitored by planning in PLC's, classroom walkthroughs, observations, and progress monitoring assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Science Lab Teacher will support with planning to increase the rigor of standards based instruction during the science block. District Science Coordinator will support with fifth grade planning during PLCs 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 unit 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.

Science scores dropped significantly. We went from 48% proficient to 32% proficient. We also realized that we did not meet district or state overall scores. The district received 48% on or above proficiency, and the state was at 47% on or above proficiency.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Planning 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. Daily practice of vocabulary will increase comprehension of science content
4. Integration of subjects will increase time spent on science content.
5. Use assessments to pull data and to review content and test taking strategies.
6. All students who scored level 1 on the ELA FSA will received layered reading interventions with grade level science texts.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Purposeful, common planning with teachers for effective standards based instruction which would include specific structures to facilitate conversation and deliberate planning of monitoring strategies, identifying critical information, and key questions. This would include providing support in identifying Power (essential) Standards, using Science Documents in planning for standards based instruction, and providing support in branches of science content to increase the knowledge about a specific topic.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)

2. All teachers will implement hands-on inquiry lessons to tie in with each standard based unit of study.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)

3. Implementation of common science vocabulary to use in all grade levels using the District's Science Standards K-5 Vocabulary Document. Use of the district Science PowerPoints for vocabulary practice will be used as well.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)

4. Teachers will integrate science content and nonfiction texts into ELA instruction using the Benchmark Advance ELA program.

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

5. Provide support in the use of Performance Matters assessments (CSAs and PMTs) and pulling data for Grades 3-5.

CSAs will be given at the culmination of each unit to review content and execution of test-taking skills

**Person Responsible** Michelle Heath (heathm@martin.k12.fl.us)

6. Interventionists will provide additional layered reading interventions to all students who received a level 1 on the ELA FSA with grade level science texts, thereby strengthening their science vocabulary and comprehension.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** 39% of students in grades 3-5 scored levels 3 and above on the 2020 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA, the remaining 61% of students scored a level 1 or 2.  
 53% of our students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 demonstrated a learning gain on the 2020 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA.  
 21% of our students in the ESE subgroup and 23% of our students in the ELL subgroup in grades 3-5 scored levels 3 and above on the 2020 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 39% to at least 50% on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA, thereby reducing the percentage of students scoring levels 1 or 2 to 50% or below.  
 The percentage of students in the lowest quartile demonstrating a learning gain in grades 3-5 will increase from 53% to 63% on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA.  
 The percentage of students in the ESE and ELL subgroups in grades 3-5 scoring levels 3 and above will increase from 21% to 31% and 23% to 33% respectively on the 2021-2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA.

**Monitoring:** The 2021-2022 administration of the grade 3-5 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA is how we will determine if we have met the minimum desired outcome. Throughout the year we will be reviewing data from multiple sources including Benchmark Advance interim, unit and weekly assessments, MTSS progress monitoring, and additional layered intervention data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennifer Radcliff (radclij@martin.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Implementation of monitoring, tracking, data collection for proficiency during ELA instruction.
2. Intentionally planned small group differentiated instruction.
3. Phonological Awareness/Phonics/Word Study curriculum across grade levels.
4. District instructional coaching cycles for use of ACCESS data and to implement ELL strategies that utilize "can do" descriptors to support and enhance their learning.
5. District instructional coaching cycles and administrative walk throughs for standards based learning and monitoring to increase rigor within the literacy block.
6. Reading interventionists will provide additional layers of reading support to ESE students and all students who scored a level 1 or 2 on the FSA ELA in addition to their tiered interventions.
7. After school tutoring will be offered to students identified as needing additional support based on the 2021 FSA ELA assessment and initial Benchmark Advance Assessments.

**Rationale  
for  
Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

1. Monitoring, tracking, and data collection will help facilitate whole group instruction and remediation/enrichment of small group instruction.
2. We selected intentionally planned small group differentiated instruction because we want to use current student data to develop individualized student plans for instruction. We will focus on small group instruction, strategy lessons, and individual conferring with readers and writers.
3. Student data shows a deficit in phonological awareness, phonics, and vocabulary. We will address this using Heggerty (K-1), Wilson Foundations (K-2), and Benchmark Advance phonological awareness/phonics/word study curriculum (K-5).
4. Use of ACCESS of ELLs "Can Do" descriptors will clarify for teachers what activities to expect from ELL students that are developmentally appropriate for their level of language acquisition.
5. We want to coach teachers to teach to the rigor of the standards and to be proficient in the delivery of instruction and monitor this through administrative classroom walkthroughs.
6. Interventionists, as well as tutors outside the instructional day, will use data to determine needs and support ESE students and students who scored level 1 or 2 on FSA ELA with small group instruction using a variety of intervention resources such as LLI, Wilson Foundations, Benchmark Advanced Intervention, and more.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. District instructional coach will provide modeling, coaching cycles, one on one planning sessions, and support grade level PLC planning times to develop teachers understanding and implementation of curriculum, formative and summative assessments, and instructional practices. This can include artifacts such as; running records, interim assessments, unit assessments, Benchmark Advanced My Reading/ Writing Student Book (K-1) and Benchmark Advanced Text For Close Reading Book (2-5).

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

2. District instructional coach will provide modeling, coaching, one on one planning sessions, and support PLC planning time around Benchmark Advanced Curriculum to develop strategy lessons, small group instruction in reading and writing and conferences within the ELA classroom. Professional development will be provided based on teacher need and student data.

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

3. Wilson Foundations will be implemented in K-2 to support achievement in phonics, word study, high frequency word study, vocabulary, handwriting, spelling, and fluency. Heggerty will be implemented in K-1 to support phonological awareness and early literacy needs. Benchmark Advanced Phonics/Word Study/ Grammar will be implemented in grades 3-5 to support these areas of need. District instructional coach will support teachers in implementing and analyzing data with respect to all of these programs.

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

4. District instructional coach will support teachers accessing, understanding/analyzing WIDA Access Data and implementation of Benchmark Advanced ELL Support to intentionally plan for ELL student instruction at their zone of proximal development.

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

5. District instructional coach will provide differentiated training and coaching cycles to support the growth of all teachers (K-5) with new implementation of Benchmark Advanced Curriculum and Administration will monitor fidelity with classroom walkthrough tools.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Radcliff (radclij@martin.k12.fl.us)

6. School based reading interventionists and tutors will obtain and analyze current data to target specific skill deficits in ELA. They will use data to group students by need, plan and deliver skill based, differentiated small group instruction in grades 3-5 using a variety of intervention resources such as LLI, Wilson Foundations, Benchmark Advanced Intervention and more in addition to core reading instruction.

**Person Responsible** Aimee Morrell (morrela@martin.k12.fl.us)

### 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.

**no areas of concern evident**

## 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.

Pinewood theme for the new year is School of PAWS-abilities. A Meet the Teacher event was held for parents to meet their child's teacher and begin an open, positive communication between families and teachers. Curriculum Night was held for parents to be introduced to and ask questions about the new Benchmark curriculum as well as previously established curriculum, and classroom procedures. Growth Mindset work continues at school and is encouraged to be used at home.

We hold several family school events that include social, cultural, as well as academic events. Events include Family Heritage Night, School Trivia Night, dances, STEM Night, and Literacy Night.

Character Counts Pillars are taught reviewed throughout the year. They will be supported through read alouds by teachers, guidance counselors, administrators, and special community guests. We also hold Student of the Month celebrations based on the Character Counts Pillar of the month for our students with their families.

Pinewood continually recruits parents to become part of our PTA and SAC communities allowing family members to have input on school goals and student achievement.

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

Stakeholders include students, families, teachers, administrators, volunteers, early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners, and school board members. All stakeholders share the roles of being positive, visible, communicating, listening, sharing, and working together. In doing the aforementioned, we create a positive school culture and environment that reflects a supportive and successful learning environment for our students. Stakeholders are invited to attend SAC, attend PTA, volunteer, and attend all PWE events. We value the knowledge and expertise of all stakeholders.

**Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$4,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0291 - Pinewood Elementary School			\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of white boards and number lines to support math instruction in the classroom.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$14,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0291 - Pinewood Elementary School			\$14,000.00
			<i>Notes: Purchasing of books to support the new BEST standards. Some distributed to classroom libraries and some are housed in the media center for check out.</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$18,000.00</b>