Volusia County Schools

Pine Trail Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pine Trail Elementary School

300 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pinetrail/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Charles Bynum D

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
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: A (70%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Volusia 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 Trail Elementary School

300 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pinetrail/pages/default.aspx

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 PK-5	No	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

Pine Trail Elementary is a family of educators working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure academic success for students in an environment that fosters social and emotional well-being.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pine Trail Elementary is a family of educators committed to providing a rich, rigorous learning environment that fosters students' social and emotional well-being where all students achieve academic success through the collaborative efforts of faculty, staff, families and community members.

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
Fisher, Tami	Principal	Instructional Leader of school
Whittley, Jody	Assistant Principal	Assistant Instructional Leader for school
Larkin, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach - Supports teachers with instructional planning, modeling lesson delivery, development of common assessments, and classroom management
Gilbert, Sandra	Teacher, ESE	Teacher of students who receive Exceptional Student Education services through Support Facilitation
O'Brien, Kenneth	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Gifted Grade 4
Reamer, Chris	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Grade 1
Reynolds, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Gifted Grade 5
Witter, Doug	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Kg
Knorr, April	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Grade 2
Kester, Jason	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Grade 4
Koskinen, Tamara	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Grade 3

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Charles Bynum D

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

673

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

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	83	77	88	66	103	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	3	3	2	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/12/2021

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	83	82	88	74	110	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	83	82	88	74	110	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				70%	56%	57%	69%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	56%	58%	58%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	46%	53%	36%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				79%	59%	63%	72%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				85%	56%	62%	66%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	43%	51%	35%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				69%	57%	53%	68%	58%	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	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	60%	14%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	77%	59%	18%	64%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	79%	54%	25%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	67%	56%	11%	53%	14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For the English Language Arts and Mathematics sections for all grade levels, the number represents the total number of students tested during the i-Ready window. Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring "Early On Grade Level" or "Mid or Above Grade Level" on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment.

For the Science section in grade 5, the number represents the total number of students tested. This number consists of more than one assessment including Elevate science curriculum topic checks and Volusia Science Assessments. Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring 70% or above on the assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	94 / 28%	95 / 66.32%	96 / 81.25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50 / 22%	51 / 56.86%	50 / 76%
	Students With Disabilities	12 / 8.33%	11 / 27.27%	11 / 54.55%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	90 / 20%	95 / 53.68%	96 / 82.29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46 / 15.22%	51 / 43.14%	50 / 78%
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 9.09%	11 / 36.36%	11 / 63.64%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	97 / 38.14%	101 / 51.49%	108 / 63.89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42 / 42.86%	44 / 40.91%	48 / 60.42%
	Students With Disabilities	25 / 20%	26 / 11.54%	29 / 34.48%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	95 / 24.21%	100 / 48%	104 / 69.23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40 / 22.50%	43 / 41.86%	46 / 54.35%
	Students With Disabilities	23 / 13.04%	26 / 11.54%	28 / 39.29%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79 / 60.76%	88 / 75%	89 / 79.78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50 / 54%	56 / 73.21%	57 / 78.95%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 23.53%	20 / 35%	20 / 50%
	English Language Learners	1 / 0.00%	1 / 100%	1 / 100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78 / 24.36%	84 / 47.62%	83 / 73.49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49 / 20.41%	55 / 40%	53 / 69.81%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 11.76%	20 / 15%	19 / 52.63%
	English Language Learners	1 / 0.00%	1 / 0.00%	1 / 100%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	117 / 46.15%	115 / 54.78%	124 / 62.90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62 / 38.71%	60 / 46.67%	65 / 55.38%
	Students With Disabilities	32 / 18.75%	32 / 21.88%	34 / 29.41%
	English Language Learners	N/A	1 / 0.00%	1 / 0.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	121 / 23.97%	115 / 59.13%	125 / 76.80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64 / 25%	60 / 55%	66 / 72.73%
	Students With Disabilities	35 / 5.71%	32 / 31.25%	35 / 42.86%
	English Language Learners	N/A	1 / 0.00%	1 / 100%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	109 / 46.43%	111 / 52.94%	108 / 58.93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49 / 34.69%	50 / 48.08%	46 / 43.75%
	Students With Disabilities	22 / 4.55%	22 / 12.50%	19 / 20%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	108 / 34.26%	111 / 57.66%	115 / 77.39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48 / 29.17%	49 / 40.82%	52 / 59.62%
	Students With Disabilities	22 / 4.55%	24 / 29.17%	22 / 40.91%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	522 / 64%	434 / 86%	299 / 86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	236 / 55%	196 / 73%	134 / 81%
	Students With Disabilities	103 / 30%	86 / 64%	56 / 70%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	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	39	50	38	52	81	75	42				
BLK	32	25		45	50		15				
HSP	72			72							
MUL	83			89							
WHT	79	67	61	86	74	69	79				
FRL	66	60	35	74	66	65	53				

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	30	60	56	40	71	68	8				
ASN	83	64		100	100						
BLK	29	53	36	32	71	58	27				
HSP	71	67		69	75						
MUL	65	70		88							
WHT	76	69	60	85	86	72	70				
FRL	62	67	54	71	81	69	58				

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	18	30	22	28	30	19	21				
ASN	92			92							
BLK	24	29		42	57						
HSP	63	46		67	69						
MUL	63	73		63	82						
WHT	73	59	44	76	65	28	72				
FRL	61	51	34	65	59	36	56				

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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	33
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	72
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	86
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	74
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	60
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?

A review of grade level data indicated areas for growth with the progress of SWD in the following grade levels:
Grade 2 data yielded limited growth on iReady ELA (14.48%) and math (26.25%). Grade 4 data yielded limited growth on ELA (10.66%). Grade 5 data yielded limited growth on ELA (15.45%).

A review of subgroup data from 2019 indicated areas for growth with the progress of BLK students in ELA achievement, learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile, and in the areas of math achievement and learning gains of the lowest quartile. With the exception of math learning gains, our students in the BLK subgroup underperformed our students in the SWD subgroup. A point of interest is this data trend is not supported when the subgroup data from 2018 is reviewed. In 2018, our students in the BLK subgroup outperformed our students in the SWD subgroup. The 2019 school year brought an influx of students in the BLK subgroup from low performing schools which had a negative impact on the 2019 data.

Review of core content area data and the School Grades Data Analysis tool indicate PTE has consistently outperformed the district and state. In 2018 ELA achievement yielded higher percentage of proficiency than math achievement, however this trend did not hold as math achievement yielded higher proficiencies in 2019. A closer look at implementation of strategies initiated during 2019 supported direct instruction in math vocabulary developed a deeper understanding of word problems for students increasing their success.

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

Data from 2021 for Pine Trail Elementary yielded ELA learning gains in the lowest quartile as an area of focus. This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency increased 4 points to 74% which exceeds the district and state average, ELA Learning Gains decreased 3 points to 67% still exceeding the district and state averages and the Lowest Quartile decreased 7 points to 46%, which was still above the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that 6 out of our 27 students in the lowest quartile fall in the ESSA Subgroup BLK and 14 of 27 students fall in the ESSA Subgroup SWD. The ESSA Subgroup BLK yielded the following scores- Increase in proficiency to 32%, decrease in LG to 25% and a decrease in LQ to 13%. The ESSA Subgroup SWD yielded the following scores- Proficiency stayed the same at 62%, an increase in LG to 61% and a decrease in LQ to 38%..

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

A review of historical data comparing the 2018 and 2019 data yielded a significant increase in math gains in 2019. One of the strategies implemented that directly impacted this increase was explicit instruction in math vocabulary. Full acquisition of understanding of the proper math terms enabled students to accurately interpret the task associated to successful completion of mathematical word problems. One strategy that will be implemented to increase learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA will be vocabulary instruction geared towards mastery of interpreting the language of the standards and understanding the necessary task to successfully complete assessments.
Grade level PLC's will meet monthly focused on responding to students' performance on assessments. Grade level teams will discuss the fidelity in implementing strategies to integrate with prior knowledge and those improving teacher clarity. Based upon student performance, the teams will develop next steps and ideas for instruction, determining which students need additional instruction or intervention to be successful and review the progress of students previously identified as needing support. Weekly, grade level teams will meet for collaborative planning purposes. They will select strategies to integrate with prior knowledge then determine learning targets/learning intentions, success criteria and assessment that align to monitor student learning. SLT members will meet weekly to review school level data and discuss the progress of each grade level or department. All collaborative efforts will strengthen teachers' ability to deliver highly effective, aligned, rigorous, Tier 1 instruction which will positively impact student performance on curriculum-based assessments.

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

Review of the 2019 data yielded learning gains in mathematics as the most improved, highest level of proficiency subcategory. Math learning gains produced 85% level of proficiency an increase of 19% when compared to the 66% proficiency yielded in 2018.

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

The identified strategy that had the highest impact on student performance resulting in the increase in proficiency of learning gains in math was explicit instruction in mathematical vocabulary utilizing the proper, universal mathematical language. Pine Trail teachers make an exerted effort to ensure math terms match the language of the standards, are used consistently horizontally and vertically across grade levels.

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

Our evidence-based strategies are Teacher Clarity and implementation of Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge. We will monitor these strategies through frequent walkthroughs by the school-based administrators and the academic coach. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive

feedback to guide them in planning and instructing, ultimately providing a positive impact on students' learning, and assisting with determining next steps.
Grade level PLC's will meet monthly focused on responding to students' performance on assessments. Grade level teams will discuss the fidelity in implementing strategies to integrate with prior knowledge and those improving teacher clarity. Based upon student performance, the teams will develop next steps and ideas for instruction, determining which students need additional instruction or intervention to be successful and review the progress of students previously identified as needing support. Weekly, grade level teams will meet for collaborative planning purposes. They will select strategies to integrate with prior knowledge then determine learning targets/learning intentions, success criteria and assessment that align to monitor student learning. SLT members will meet weekly to review school level data and discuss the progress of each grade level or department. All collaborative efforts will strengthen teachers' ability to deliver highly effective, aligned, rigorous, Tier 1 instruction which will positively impact student performance on curriculum-based assessments.

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.

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Collaborative Planning. Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity and on Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge during ERPLs and Teacher duty days. Schedule non-negotiable collaborative team planning dates and PLC dates.

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

Monitoring through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Coaching cycles will be implemented based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Tami Fisher and Assistant Principal Jody Whittley and Academic Coach Stefanie Larkin.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency increased 4 points to 74% which exceeds the district and state average, ELA Learning Gains decreased 3 points to 67% still exceeding the district and state averages and the Lowest Quartile decreased 7 points to 46%, which was still above the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that 6 out of our 27 students in the lowest quartile fall in the ESSA Subgroup BLK and 14 of 27 students fall in the ESSA Subgroup SWD. The ESSA Subgroup BLK yielded the following scores- Increase in proficiency to 32%, decrease in LG to 25% and a decrease in LQ to 13%. The ESSA Subgroup SWD yielded the following scores- Proficiency stayed the same at 62%, an increase in LG to 61% and a decrease in LQ to 38%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA overall LG by 8 percentage points to 75%. Increase ELA LQ learning gains by 8 percentage points to 54%. In the ESSA Subgroup BLK, increase LG by 25 percentage points to 50% and increase LQ learning gains by 33 percentage points to 50%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Coaching cycles will be implemented based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Tami Fisher and Assistant Principal Jody Whittley and Academic Coach Stefanie Larkin.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategies are Teacher Clarity and implementation of Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge. We will monitor these strategies through frequent walkthroughs by the school-based administrators and the academic coach. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing, ultimately providing a positive impact on students' learning, and assisting with determining next steps. Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 and the implementation of Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge has an effect size of 0.93 (Hattie, 2009). The average effect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75 and 0.93 respectively, it is likely that the impact on students will be significantly greater than average when teacher clarity and strategies to integrate with prior knowledge are implemented with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie describes Teacher Clarity and excellent teachers as those who: • have appropriately high expectations. • share their notions of success criteria with their students. • ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. • ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and • provide welcome feedback about where to move to next. John Hattie describes Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge as excellent teachers who: • establish connections between a text and students' prior knowledge

• discover from students what they already know and build on the initial knowledge
• find out the connections and experiences students already have with a particular topic and build new connections

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity and Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge.

Person Responsible Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity and on Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge during ERPLs and Teacher duty days.

Person Responsible Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of Focus Notebooks in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions, Success Criteria, and space to demonstrate prior knowledge. These measures will ensure students know what they are learning and how new learning connects to prior learning.

Person Responsible Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Team Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/ benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks as well as what strategies will be used to activate/build prior knowledge. Planning will also include teachers “doing the work, to know the work” to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing work with teacher clarity and strategies to integrate with prior knowledge during team planning and PLCs integrating the following questions into their discussions: What can the new learning be connected to? How are we going to facilitate making this connection? Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

Person Responsible Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate PLCs focused on responding to students’ performance on assessments. Discuss the fidelity in implementing strategies to integrate with prior knowledge and those improving teacher clarity. Develop next steps and ideas for instruction. Determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful and review the progress of students previously identified as needing support.

Person Responsible Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that the Lowest Quartile decreased 7 points to 46%, which was still above the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that 6 out of our 27 students in the lowest quartile fall in the ESSA Subgroup BLK and 14 of 27 students fall in the ESSA Subgroup SWD. The ESSA Subgroup BLK yielded the following scores- Increase in proficiency to 32%, decrease in LG to 25% and a decrease in LQ to 13%. The ESSA Subgroup SWD yielded the following scores- Proficiency stayed the same at 62%, an increase in LG to 61% and a decrease in LQ to 38%. SLT collaborative discussion yielded a stark difference in the prior experience/background knowledge of the students in the BLK subgroup we service when compared to their same age/grade peers in the White subgroup supporting a specific need to incorporate intentional planning to build background knowledge.
Measurable Outcome:	Grade level PLC's will meet monthly focused on responding to students' performance on assessments. Grade level teams will discuss the fidelity in implementing strategies to integrate with prior knowledge and those improving teacher clarity. Based upon student performance, the teams will develop next steps and ideas for instruction, determining which students need additional instruction or intervention to be successful and review the progress of students previously identified as needing support. Weekly, grade level teams will meet for collaborative planning purposes. They will select strategies to integrate with prior knowledge then determine learning targets/learning intentions, success criteria and assessment that align to monitor student learning. SLT members will meet weekly to review school level data and discuss the progress of each grade level or department. All collaborative efforts will strengthen teachers' ability to deliver highly effective, aligned, rigorous, Tier 1 instruction which will positively impact student performance on curriculum-based assessments.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent visits to team planning and PLCs using a list of Look Fors as teams collaborate. Aspects of collaboration regarding building prior knowledge will also be evident in teacher developed lesson plans. Assistance with planning for prior knowledge will be provided based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Tami Fisher and Assistant Principal Jody Whittley and Academic Coach Stefanie Larkin.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through collaboration, teachers will develop plans including strategies to integrate with prior knowledge, explicit teaching strategies and situated learning with scaffolding. Implementation of these strategies will be monitored through frequent visits to team planning and PLCs using a list of Look Fors as teams collaborate. Aspects of collaboration regarding building prior knowledge will also be evident in teacher developed lesson plans. Assistance with planning for prior knowledge will be provided based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Tami Fisher and Assistant Principal Jody Whittley and Academic Coach Stefanie Larkin.
Rationale for Evidence-	In John Hattie's research, strategies to integrate with prior knowledge have an effect size of d=0.93, explicit teaching strategies have an effect size of d=0.57 and situated learning with scaffolding has an effect size of d=0.58. With the average effect size being 0.40, which is

equal to approximately one year of learning, these strategies have the potential to accelerate or considerable accelerate student achievement.

John Hattie describes Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge as excellent teachers who:
• establish connections between a text and students' prior knowledge
• discover from students what they already know and build on the initial knowledge
• find out the connections and experiences students already have with a particular topic and build new connections

based Strategy:

John Hattie describes Explicit Teaching Strategies as excellent teachers who:
• use a series of supports or scaffolds guiding students through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill
• have clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target
• provide supported practice with feedback until independent mastery has been achieved

John Hattie describes situated learning with scaffolding as excellent teachers who:
• believe the assumption that learning takes place in a social context
• teach subject matter in a meaningful, realistic, and contextually rich way that enables students to understand its relationship to what they already know
• establishes and then gradually removes outside assistance that enable students to complete educational tasks

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Collaborative Planning.

Person Responsible Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Collaborative Planning specifically focusing on Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge, Explicit Teaching Strategies and Situated Learning with Scaffolding during ERPLs and Teacher duty days.

Person Responsible Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Schedule non-negotiable collaborative team planning dates and PLC dates.

Person Responsible Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency increased 4 points to 74% which exceeds the district and state average, ELA Learning Gains decreased 3 points to 67% still exceeding the district and state averages and the Lowest Quartile decreased 7 points to 46%, which was still above the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that 6 out of our 27 students in the lowest quartile fall in the ESSA Subgroup BLK and 14 of 27 students fall in the ESSA Subgroup SWD. The ESSA Subgroup BLK yielded the following scores- Increase in proficiency to 32%, decrease in LG to 25% and a decrease in LQ to 13%. The ESSA Subgroup SWD yielded the following scores- Proficiency stayed the same at 62%, an increase in LG to 61% and a decrease in LQ to 38%.
Measurable Outcome:	Grade level PLC's will meet monthly focused on responding to students' performance on assessments. Grade level teams will discuss the fidelity in implementing strategies to integrate with prior knowledge and those improving teacher clarity. Based upon student performance, the teams will develop next steps and ideas for instruction, determining which students need additional instruction or intervention to be successful and review the progress of students previously identified as needing support. Weekly, grade level teams will meet for collaborative planning purposes. They will select strategies to integrate with prior knowledge then determine learning targets/learning intentions, success criteria and assessment that align to monitor student learning. SLT members will meet weekly to review school level data and discuss the progress of each grade level or department. All collaborative efforts will strengthen teachers' ability to deliver highly effective, aligned, rigorous, Tier 1 instruction which will positively impact student performance on curriculum based assessments.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent visits to team planning and PLCs using a list of Look Fors as teams collaborate. Aspects of collaboration will also be evident when conducting classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA look-fors. Coaching cycles will be added based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Tami Fisher and Assistant Principal Jody Whittley and Academic Coach Stefanie Larkin.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through collaboration, teachers will develop plans including strategies to integrate with prior knowledge, explicit teaching strategies and situated learning with scaffolding. Implementation of these strategies will be monitored through frequent visits to team planning and PLCs using a list of Look Fors as teams collaborate. Aspects of collaboration will also be evident when conducting classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA look-fors. Coaching cycles will be added based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Tami Fisher and Assistant Principal Jody Whittley and Academic Coach Stefanie Larkin.
Rationale for Evidence-	In John Hattie's research, strategies to integrate with prior knowledge have an effect size of d=0.93, explicit teaching strategies have an effect size of d=0.57 and situated learning with scaffolding has an effect size of d=0.58. With the average effect size being 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning, these strategies have the potential to

accelerate or considerable accelerate student achievement.

John Hattie describes Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge as excellent teachers who:
• establish connections between a text and students' prior knowledge
• discover from students what they already know and build on the initial knowledge
• find out the connections and experiences students already have with a particular topic and build new connections

based Strategy:

John Hattie describes Explicit Teaching Strategies as excellent teachers who:
• use a series of supports or scaffolds guiding students through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill
• have clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target
• provide supported practice with feedback until independent mastery has been achieved

John Hattie describes situated learning with scaffolding as excellent teachers who:
• believe the assumption that learning takes place in a social context
• teach subject matter in a meaningful, realistic, and contextually rich way that enables students to understand its relationship to what they already know
• establishes and then gradually removes outside assistance that enable students to complete educational tasks

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Collaborative Planning.

Person Responsible Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Collaborative Planning specifically focusing on Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge, Explicit Teaching Strategies and Situated Learning with Scaffolding during ERPLs and Teacher duty days.

Person Responsible Stephanie Larkin (salarkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Schedule non-negotiable collaborative team planning dates and PLC dates.

Person Responsible Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Team Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/ benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks as well as strategies to integrate with prior knowledge, explicit teaching strategies and situated learning with scaffolding. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Tami Fisher (tpfisher@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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.

Pine Trail Elementary discipline data yields in the low range, 0.3 incidents per 100 students. This is less than the statewide rate for elementary schools, 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Data showed 43 out-of-school suspensions in 2018 which decreased to 27 in 2019. According to discipline data in Focus, the out-of-school suspensions held at 27 for the 2020-2021 school year. A deeper dive in this data showed that primary offense resulting in an out-of-school suspension was hitting/striking of other students or of an employee. According to the Florida School Safety Dashboard, Volusia County Elementary schools have shown a steady decline in reported incidents of fighting with 301 in 2017, 248 in 2018 and 66 in 2019. Pine Trail Elementary has the anomaly of having 3 units of students with emotional behavior disorders on site. Pine Trail Elementary will continue to utilize CARS with students in the EBD unit to decrease physically aggressive outbursts and Sanford Harmony school-wide for Social Emotional Learning. In addition, Pine Trail Elementary has begun working with Nick Prince to provide diversity training and implementation of Restorative Practices. This is particularly important as Pine Trail Elementary is a receiving school for students whose parents choose to remove them from a school earning a "D" or "F" on the school accountability report. This has changed the student population, and has brought an influx of students from poverty with academic deficits and behavioral issues. Training the faculty on understanding and building relationships with these students will improve their efforts with educating ALL students and making sure ALL students succeed. Implementation of strategies will be monitored through monthly meetings to review discipline data and threat assessments.

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 Trail Elementary strengthens a positive school culture and environment through shared visioning and community building inside and outside of school. Pine Trail stakeholders include an actively involved Parent Teacher Associations and School Advisory Council. Teachers utilize Sanford Harmony for Social Emotional Learning which includes lessons in diversity, inclusion, empathy, critical thinking, communication, problem solving and peer relationships. PTE has collaborated with Nicholas Prince, Volusia County Schools Minority Achievement Specialist to facilitate training of and collaboration with teachers on restorative practices, diversity and equity. Mr. Prince is providing teachers with additional strategies to help meet the needs of students, especially the students included in the BLK subgroup. The percentage of the student body

included in the BLK subgroup has steadily increased since 2019. Many of the teachers at Pine Trail Elementary have only taught at Pine Trail Elementary or schools with similar demographics to the demographics of PTE prior to the VCS implementation of a program that allows students from consistently underperforming schools to transfer to designated high performing schools. Mr. Prince is helping to increase awareness of the unique cultural and environmental needs of these students and building a positive school culture for all students.

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

Tami Fisher - Articulating a school-wide mission and set of core values

Tami Fisher/Jody Whittley/PTA -Developing robust opportunities for community and family engagement and participation in school growth

Jody Whittley/Agnes Ingram/Nick Prince - Reassess the relationship between discipline and management within the broader objective of strengthening pedagogy

Nick Prince/Stefanie Larkin -Train staff in Restorative Practices; familiarize families & caregivers in Restorative Practices

Tami Fisher/Jody Whittley - Disaggregate and disseminate Panorama Survey and Climate Survey data results

Melissa Woodward - Continue facilitation of Pine Trail Elementary life skills awareness and development campaign; Assist teachers with consistent implementation of SEL instruction

All teachers - Provide SEL instruction in every classroom

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**