

District School Board of Madison County

Pinetta Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Pinetta Elementary School

135 NE EMPRESS TREE AVE, Pinetta, FL 32350

<http://pes.madison.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Yolanda Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	94%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Madison County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Pinetta Elementary School

135 NE EMPRESS TREE AVE, Pinetta, FL 32350

<http://pes.madison.k12.fl.us/>

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-6	Yes	90%
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		C	C	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We believe all children can be successful, just not on the same day in the same way.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pinetta Elementary School is committed to providing an environment which will enhance the growth and development of the whole child.

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
Kendrick, Amy	Principal	Ms. Kendrick manages and oversees the daily operations of the school.
Minor, Christi	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Minor serves a multi role position at the school. one of Coordinator and the other as RTI specialist. Mrs. Minor works with teachers to make sure students are receiving what they need and getting the individualized instruction. She also works with the teachers to serve their needs and develop them

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Yolanda Davis

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

10

Total number of students enrolled at the school

134

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	18	8	7	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	5	5	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	2	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	5	4	1	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/16/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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				53%	52%	57%	64%	64%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	50%	58%	58%	60%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	49%	53%	39%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				66%	57%	63%	69%	74%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	49%	62%	68%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	43%	51%	37%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	56%	53%	70%	48%	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	44%	40%	4%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	50%	7%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	46%	7%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	45%	15%	62%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	51%	10%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	44%	23%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	42%	7%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23	76	96
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	60	96
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	70	95
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23	38	62
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	56	89
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	23	72
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	43	4256
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	37	80
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23	41	56
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	53	55
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	30			40							
WHT	65	45		82	80		50				
FRL	55	69		66	83		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	33	36		62	71		42				
BLK	30	33		32	53						
WHT	60	49	40	72	67	45	56				
FRL	51	40	23	62	63	46	57				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	33	44		52	56						
BLK	40	47		56	58	50					
WHT	71	60		73	69		95				
FRL	57	58	42	68	69	40	63				

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	61
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	306
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	64
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	63
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?

ELA learning gains for African American students decreased from 47.4% to 33.3% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019. 30% of African American students scored at Proficiency level of 3 or higher on 2018-2019 FSA/ELA assessment.

40% of African American students scored at Proficiency level of 3 or higher on 2017-2018 FSA/ELA assessment.

Therefore percentage of African American students scoring proficiency declined by 10 percentage points.

ELA learning gains for African American students decreased from 57.9% to 33.3% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019. 31.7% of African American students scored at Proficiency level of 3 or higher on 2018-2019 FSA/ELA assessment.

46% of African American students scored at Proficiency level of 3 or higher on 2017-2018 FSA/ELA assessment.

Therefore percentage of African American students scoring proficiency declined by 15 percentage points.

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

Based on iReady Progress Monitoring data, 4th and 5th grade students demonstrated greatest need for improvement in ELA. Learning gains in ELA declined from 58% to 45% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school years. Proficiency in ELA declined from 64% to 53% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school years. Learning gains in Mathematics declined from 68% to 55% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school years. Proficiency in Science declined from 70% to 53% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school years.

Based on FSA, African American students in grades 3-5 demonstrated greatest need for improvement in Mathematics.

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

Instructional changes of classroom teachers and lack of effective intervention based curriculum. Teachers have been reassigned for different grade levels. The purchase and implementation of Level Literacy Intervention to use during Triple I time for Reading and Writing.

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

Learning gains in Mathematics for students in the Lower Quartile increased from 37% to 53% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school years.

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

Team time was built into the Master Schedule to ensure interventions were being used to assist students.

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

Maintain use of team time to ensure students are able to receive their interventions.
Build in enrichment and accelerated activities for students scoring at and above proficiency level 3.
District Literacy coach will work with teachers weekly on instructional strategies and data analysis.

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.

BEST Standards professional development
LLI Professional Development
Rural Connect Literacy Professional Development

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

Network with other K-5 schools with similar demographics to determine usual strategies and techniques.
Use of District level instructional coaches for Early Literacy, Stem Coach, General Instructional Coach.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>47% of 3rd Grade students did not score at Proficiency level 3 on FSA/ELA 2021 assessment.</p> <p>44% of 4th Grade students did not score at Proficiency level 3 on FSA/ELA 2021 assessment.</p> <p>37% of 5th Grade students did not score at Proficiency level 3 on FSA/ELA 2021 assessment.</p> <p>100% of KG students were on target to score level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA assessment. (Only 50% of these students, current 1st graders, scored on target on 1st iReady progress monitoring assessment for 2021)</p> <p>8% of 1st grade students were not on target to score level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA assessment during 2021 last iReady progress monitoring assessment given in May 2021.</p> <p>5% of 2nd grade students were not on target to score level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA assessment during 2021 last iReady progress monitoring assessment given in May 2021.</p> <p>11% of 3rd grade students were not on target to score level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA assessment during 2021 last iReady progress monitoring assessment given in May 2021.</p> <p>Students who do not score well on iReady Progress monitoring in lower grades of KG, 1st, and 2nd grades will struggle in reading. Therefore, we use the iReady Progress monitoring data to determine areas of need and work to improve student deficits. This area was identified as a critically needed area based on 3rd grade FSA/ELA performance and iReady progress monitoring data.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>90% of students in KG will score on target level for FSA/ELA assessment using the iReady progress monitoring in 2022.</p> <p>80% of students in 1st Grade will score on target level for FSA/ELA assessment using the iReady progress monitoring in 2022.</p> <p>92% of students in 2nd Grade will score on target level for FSA/ELA assessment using the iReady progress monitoring in 2022.</p> <p>60% of students in Grade 3 will score at Proficiency level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA in 2022.</p> <p>58% of students in Grade 4 will score at Proficiency level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA in 2022.</p> <p>57% of students in Grade 5 will score at Proficiency level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA in 2022.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Teachers will analyze data and work on data driven instructional planning during Professional Learning Communities. During the PLCs teachers will review weekly skills and re-teach activities and strategies will be used to augment instruction. The PLCs are led by administration. Administration will conduct informal walkthroughs and observations to monitor instructional practices.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>[no one identified]</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Triple-I time (Individual Intensive Interventions) in which one on one instruction or small group instruction is provided to students in areas of need.</p> <p>Triple-I time is held for 30 minutes during each school day.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>We Initially began to implement the strategy based on state of Florida mandates for students for the area of ELA. Previously our master schedule did not have Triple-I time built in so teachers could implement individual or small group instruction. Therefore, we designed our master schedule to accommodate a 30 minute Triple-I time.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Walk throughs and classroom observations during Triple-I time to ensure teachers are providing small group or individual instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible Amy Kendrick (amy.kendrick@mcsbfl.us)

Weekly lesson plans will be monitored to ensure teachers are planning based on data presented during PLCs have students take standard based tests. Lesson plans will be reviewed to ensure teachers are changing the small groups of students or individual students based on data.

Person Responsible Christi Minor (christi.minor@mcsbfl.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.

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.

PES begins by letting all students know it's mission and vision. We believe in setting expectations and communicating them to the students at the beginning of the year and through out the year.

WE use PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Supports) to encourage and implement systems that are set in place so that all kids know the difference between positive and negative behaviors.

Some of the things that PES has implemented;

-Daily check In/Check outs- The school has identified those students who have various needs. These students are divided up and assigned a mentor within the school (teachers, paraprofessionals, custodians, etc). These helps keep students main focus not just on academics, but behavior too. They earn a punch on a punch card. When the punch card is completed, they earn a reward.

-Trading Post- because we are the Pinetta Indians, we have created a school store and called it the "trading post". Students can earn "brave bucks" throughout the week to spend at the school store.

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

PES believes in family engagement. The school has planned dances, movie nights, and literacy nights where parents are invited and meals are served.

PTO- Monthly the schools PTO meets to discuss upcoming events, spending of funds and ways we can earn funds that are spent in the "trading post" and other positive behavior rewards

PES works with local community helpers, such as the local 4H, Fire Deptmartment, and Sherrifs (DARE) department to promote educational experiences for our kids.

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
Total:			\$0.00