Escambia County School District

Pine Meadow Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pine Meadow Elementary School

10001 OMAR AVE, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Morris R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Escambia 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 Meadow Elementary School

10001 OMAR AVE, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	80%

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

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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 School Mission at Pine Meadow Elementary is to provide high levels of learning in a culture of collaboration and respect between students, faculty, staff, and parents. We will achieve and gain a sense of purpose through hard work, kindness, and high expectations in a safe and positive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision for Pine Meadow Elementary is to be an environment that encourages the learning and development of the individual student in all phases of academic, physical, creative, and emotional experiences by providing a positive school climate. Pine Meadow will be a place where not only students learn, but educators learn and refine their skills, and where parents learn skills to help their child learn. A place where all stakeholders are involved in making a positive difference in the lives of students by preparing them for lifelong learning.

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
Greenberg, Elizabeth	Principal	
Hale, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
Garrison, Pamela	Behavior Specialist	
Lassiter, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
Chism, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	
Dawson, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Garic, Tara	Teacher, K-12	
Stroud, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
harrison, casey	Teacher, K-12	
	School Counselor	
Mathis, Maxine		

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/26/2019, Dawn Morris R

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.*
3

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

745

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

5

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

11

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	132	142	123	113	131	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	737
Attendance below 90 percent	8	54	33	30	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	8	8	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	4	3	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	31	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	24	15	13	26	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	8	9	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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

Friday 9/10/2021

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	95	113	117	122	98	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	4	20	12	13	7	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	6	4	0	0	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	

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	95	113	117	122	98	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	4	20	12	13	7	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	6	4	0	0	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 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				64%	53%	57%	63%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	55%	58%	47%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	53%	27%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	57%	63%	70%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	60%	62%	65%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	52%	51%	40%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	54%	53%	66%	55%	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	71%	56%	15%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	67%	55%	12%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	58%	22%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	55%	-2%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	56%	55%	1%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The data below is compiled from Renaissance STAR 360 and Subgroup data provided by the District.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56 51.9%	76 69.1%	75 67.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 39.6%8/20.0%	35 66.0%	38 69.1%
	Students With Disabilities	2 22.2%4/28.6%	4 40.0%	2 20.0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47 43.9%	64 59.8%	72 64.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19 35.8%	32 59.3%	32 59.3%
	Students With Disabilities	2 22.2%	1 11.1%	1 10.0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49 48.0%	64 62.1%	70 66.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16 44.4%	20 54.1%	21 56.8%
	Students With Disabilities	3 18.8%	3 18.8%	3 20.0%
	English Language Learners	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39 38.6%	31 39.7%	49 46.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 30.6%	11 34.4%	12 32.4%
	Students With Disabilities	4 25.0%	4 30.8%	4 26.7%
	English Language Learners	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57 49.1%	58 54.7%	74 67.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19 41.3%	17 42.5%	24 60.0%
	Students With Disabilities	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 44.4%
	English Language Learners	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49 43.0%	55 53.9%	64 58.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 26.1%	20 51.3%	20 50.0%
	Students With Disabilities	0 0.0%	2 22.2%	2 22.2%
	English Language Learners	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44 50.6%	56 62.2%	50 59.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44 50.6% 14 46.7%	16 51.6%	14 48.3%
	Students With Disabilities	1 8.3%	0 0.0%	2 20.0%
	English Language Learners	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41 50.0%	57 64.0%	53 63.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 32.1%	14 45.2%	16 55.2%
	Students With Disabilities	1 9.1%	4 44.4%	2 20.0%
	English Language Learners	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40 39.2%	51 49.5%	59 60.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16 34.8%	22 48.9%	23 54.8%
	Students With Disabilities	2 25.0%	1 9.1%	3 33.3%
	English Language Learners	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35 34.7%	44 42.7%	52 53.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 22.2%	11 24.4%	20 47.6%
	Students With Disabilities	0 0.0%	1 9.1%	1 11.1%
	English Language Learners	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	26 44.8%	46 54.1%	28 45.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 48.0%	17 44.7%	9 36.0%
	Students With Disabilities	0 0.0%	1 14.3%	1 16.7%
	English Language Learners	N/A	1 50.0%	N/A

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	30		27	20		20				
BLK	42	31		34	6		19				
HSP	73	82		59	45		82				
MUL	71			65							
WHT	71	58	55	64	50	36	58				
FRL	52	50	33	50	40	28	40				

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	37	47	50	43	37	21	26				
BLK	43	43	50	48	49	29	33				
HSP	60	54		72	46		64				
MUL	79	80		65	69						

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
WHT	71	60	42	72	62	48	62				
FRL	60	54	48	60	53	39	43				

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	26	28	19	47	34	10	19				
BLK	42	41	16	48	46	21	50				
HSP	74	53		74	68						
MUL	74	57		74	57		70				
WHT	67	48	31	76	69	48	68				
FRL	56	42	24	68	61	35	52				

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	49
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	344
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
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	68
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	68
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	56
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	42
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?

School Data-Lowest performance is gains within Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Although this showed a slight increase from the previous year overall in grades 3-5, is significantly below our other areas and below both the District and State. Math projected scores overall showed a decline in proficiency percentage and percent of students making gains.

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

The data component that showed the greatest need for improvement was Math learning gains within the Low Quartile group and Math proficiency within our SWD subgroup.

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 include COVID related closures and online learning platforms, which caused a gap in Math foundational skills.
Strengthen TIER 1 instruction and include TIER 2 strategies during small group differentiated Math instruction.

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

Largest improvement was in lowest quartile scores for ELA gain performance.

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

Accelerated Reader, paired with school-wide Thinking Map implementation for writing, and focused small group instruction allowed for significant improvement.

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

1. Strengthen TIER 1 class instruction
2. Provide focused interventions in small group settings
3. Utilize research-based programs and tools for TIER 2 and TIER 3 instruction.

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.

iReady Training- ELA and Math
Reflex Math Training
Thinking Map Writing Training

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

Reflex Math- Student math fluency
RtI Coordinator- Small group interventions for intensive students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lowest area of performance as well a largest gap between Rationale school and state performance. Subgroup of students with disabilities is below 40%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students having learning gains/or proficiency within math lowest 25th percentile and subgroup of SWD to 50%
Monitoring:	- Daily classroom walkthroughs - STAR 360 data chats - iReady usage - FOCUS assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Extend mathematics academic learning time proportionate to the student's academic needs
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All students receive 60 minutes of math instruction daily. Lowest 25th percentile students will require not only more time for instruction but strategic and targeted based on their needs. * To become proficient in the application of newly acquired skills and strategies, students with the most intensive instructional needs will need multiple opportunities to practice with immediate high-quality feedback. With one-on-one and small-group instruction, teachers can provide immediate and individualized feedback. * Students with intensive needs require substantial supports during the initial stages of learning. As students progress in their understanding and knowledge, these supports are gradually withdrawn so that students can begin to apply skills and strategies independently. * Teachers can optimize limited instructional time and instruction by teaching skills or strategies that reinforce each other.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Targeted small groups will be identified and assigned specific curriculum targets based on progress monitoring data through out the school year.
2. Data will be reviewed after each progress monitoring period and small group and instructional targets will be adjusted based on current data.
3. Walkthroughs during small group math instruction to calibrate the lens for math expectations.
4. Tutoring for specific groups of students based on students will be offered.
5. Curriculum Night with Math Focus offered in the fall for parents, students, and teachers.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although there has been growth in this area, school is performing just at the state average. Students below proficiency need to make gains each year and those at proficiency need to maintain and show growth.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in Reading/ELA to 65% with an increased focus on Lowest 25th percentile and SWD subgroup.
Monitoring:	Classroom Walk-throughs Star data chats iReady usage Bi-weekly grade level planning
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Plan ELA academic learning time and rigor of activities proportionate to the student's academic needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensure needs of students are being met through small group instruction. Strengthen Tier 1 and utilize decision tree to determine evidence based interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Targeted small groups will be identified and assigned specific curriculum targets based on progress monitoring data through out the school year.
2. Data will be reviewed after each progress monitoring period and small group and instructional targets will be adjusted based on current data.
3. Walkthroughs during small group ELA instruction to ensure curriculum is aligned to rigor of standards/ expectations.
4. Tutoring for specific groups of students based on data will be offered.
5. Accelerated Reader School Wide Initiative enhanced.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Decrease in Math proficiency, as compared to the District and State on the FSA Assessment and STAR 360.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math proficiency to 60% and Low Quartile gains to 50%.
Monitoring:	Classroom walkthroughs to ensure math fluency practice is implemented, along with analyzing data from STAR, iReady, and weekly assessments to determine small group interventions and student needs in the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Hale (lhale@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady provided lesson paths, along with teacher prescribed lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The iReady pathways, both teacher created or system generated, ensure students are working at or above their capabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Will review data with teachers to ensure curriculum is aligned to standards and remediation occurs as necessary.
2. Set up and ensure use of iReady and Reflex Math to enhance fact fluency practice.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PMES has shown a decrease in the past few years with Science Proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase percentage of students achieving science proficiency to 65%.
Monitoring:	Use of CER writing within science instruction to justify understanding of science standards after experiments. Study Island 3-5 Non-Fiction Reading
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Hale (lhale@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of CER writing within science instruction to justify understanding of science standards after experiments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Moving from knowledge of content to understanding and application of knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Will review data with teachers to ensure curriculum is aligned to standards and remediation occurs as necessary.
2. Set up and ensure use of STEAM labs to enhance the hands on experience and science lab instruction.
3. Utilize CER writing within Science Instruction

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

The MTSS team will meet on a weekly basis to review student progress through the MTSS process, with a focus on students with 2 or more early warning indicator systems, such as Level 1 on statewide assessments and attendance below 90 percent.
Team members review screening data and link data to instructional decisions. They also review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/
exceeding benchmarks and those who are at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources that are needed to
meet the needs of students in MTSS.
The team will collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, practice new processes and skills, and make decisions about current and future implementation.

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.

A written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) in collaboration with parents, community stakeholders, and school personnel responsible for implementing the plan. The PFEP will assess the previous year's PFEP results and current needs. The plan will outline goals, strategies, and activities to better communicate with families and will focus on building the capacity of parents to address the needs of all students, in particular those most at-risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards. The PFEP will be reviewed by District Title 1 office and the reviewed plan will be disseminated to parents and stakeholders. A family-School Compact will also be developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders. The school's Title 1 budget will directly support the PFEP.
Students are encouraged and celebrated as they meet academic goals in ELA and Math. They are also recognized for their successes as a school leaders and role-models through various student of the month awards and activities.
Teachers are also recognized for the positive role they play in student learning. Monthly teacher and staff celebrations build a positive school culture. Mrs. Greenberg and Ms. Hale complete daily walkthroughs and

provide positive feedback, along with growth strategies to assist with classroom instruction and curricular alignment.
Each week, classes compete for prizes by wearing their Pine Meadow T-shirts. PTA provides a weekly "Spirit Day" prize to the class with the highest participation, which enhances school culture and environment.

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

Pine Meadow works closely with the community and has worked to build positive culture through teacher donations at the school level. Publix Supermarket recently donated $5,000 in teacher gift cards for student supplies. Each teacher received gift cards to be used on any supplies they needed.
Mrs. Greenberg also recently completed a grant through a local law office in Pensacola and received math fluency games for teachers to utilize during classroom instruction. Teacher manipulatives, supplies, and games for the classroom are always a welcome and necessary tool to maximize student engagement and learning gains.
PTA works diligently to promote positive school culture. They sponsor teacher and student breakfasts, lunches, and activities, as well as supporting teachers with organizing classroom materials.