

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Pinecrest Elementary School



2022-23 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	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pinecrest Elementary School

7950 LITHIA PINECREST RD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Denise Mobley

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (44%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Hillsborough 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	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pinecrest Elementary School

7950 LITHIA PINECREST RD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Provide
Instructional
Learning
Opportunities
To
Succeed

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a learning community where everyone achieves success as we prepare students for life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mobley, Denise	Principal	Administration
Cook, Debbie	SAC Member	School Advisory Council Chair
Turner, kellie	Parent Engagement Liaison	Parent Engagement Liaison

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Denise Mobley

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

536

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	72	80	91	90	84	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	15	14	12	12	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	34	51	35	41	31	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Course failure in Math	19	16	16	32	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	31	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	32	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	34	51	35	41	31	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/7/2022

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	87	86	89	79	100	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	13	8	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	28	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	6	5	14	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	87	86	89	79	100	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	13	8	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	28	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	6	5	14	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	37%	53%	56%				47%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						47%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						41%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	40%	50%	50%				51%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%						55%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						42%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	59%	59%				48%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	46%	51%	-5%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	14	32	30	14	35	37	29				
ELL	26	52	56	27	35	36	23				
HSP	25	51	53	26	38	31	30				
WHT	43	56	39	46	57	35	52				
FRL	33	54	41	30	48	38	34				

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	20			9							
ELL	25	27		17	27		7				
HSP	30	38		25	30		17				
WHT	43	31		45	38		37				
FRL	38	36	43	32	33	42	24				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	37	29	27	52	46	29				
ELL	19	33	23	26	40	31	24				
HSP	32	43	33	41	51	44	30				
MUL	40			50							
WHT	54	51	57	56	57	41	58				
FRL	42	46	37	42	49	41	40				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

It is evident based on our proficiency rates in grades 3-5 including our SWD, ELL, and Hispanic subgroups outline trends with proficiency levels below the 50% range. Third grade data showed a significant decrease in student data from 42% to 21%. In review of our current subgroup data, our ELL, Hispanic, and SWD students perform significantly below other subgroups as their federal index falls below the 41%. Although 4th grade proficiency showed an increase,

What data components, based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA continues to be a focus area for improvement as evident when comparing our 2022 FSA data. In 2022 37% of our 3rd-5th graders scored a level 3 or higher on the ELA FSA. This is a 3% decrease from 2021 data with 40% scoring at a level 3 or higher. Our 2022 FSA math data reflects a 1% increase from 29% in 2021 to 30% in 2022. Our science scores showed improvement with a 15% increase from 30% in 2021 to 45% in 2022.

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

Students entering a grade already below level has drastically impacted their on grade level performance. Although teachers differentiate for students at their lower level, there is still a need to ensure they are exposed and working on grade level concepts. In addition to differentiation strategies being used, we continue to implement acceleration strategies to enhance students on grade level performance. We also need to focus on building background knowledge and vocabulary.

What data components, based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Although our student proficiency is not where we need them, our students made huge overall learning gains in both ELA and Math. 2022 ELA learning gains increased 21% from 34% in 2021 to 55% in 2022. Our Math gains increased by 16% from 36% in 2021 to 52% in 2022.

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

Intentional standard based planning with instructional coaches including targeted skill interventions strategies. Engaging teachers in deep data drives to identify student needs and goal setting.

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

Identifying the critical skills students are missing and provide intentional scaffolding to bridge the gap for students who are struggling. Ensure students are receiving these scaffolds during core instruction so that students may have access to grade level concepts and content. Use intervention time to target specific skills or concepts that students are lacking to be successful with grade level content. Use progress monitoring and data to drive instruction and plan acceleration at key points for students success.

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.

During preplanning all teachers will have professional development on teacher strategies and methods to accelerate learning in all subject areas. Instructional coaches will maximize on this learning and provide job imbedded professional development where they can put these newly learned methods into practice. Instructional coaches will continue to provide coaching cycles, data analysis, demonstration lessons, and planning sessions to support and foster growth in teachers.

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

In addition to a reading coach, this year we also have the support of a math coach. Instructional coaches will meet weekly with teachers to ensure standard based planning including best practices and strategies to strengthen our core instruction. Grade level PLC will also collaborate on implementation of acceleration strategies to close the achievement gap for our students. Coaching Cycles will also help us to build capacity among our teacher to create strong instructional leaders that can thus support one another as they grow in their craft.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

In review of our 2022 FSA data, students demonstrating proficiency is below 50%, showing a need to strengthen our core instruction. Pinecrest will use collaborative planning to focus on strengthening our core instruction through better understanding of BEST standards, instructional, practices, and alignment to instruction.

**Measurable
Outcome:****State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Through collaborative planning, instructional coaching, and job embedded professional development, we will strengthen our instructional practices to enhance our core instruction. As a result our student proficiency levels will increase by 3% as measured by the FAST progress monitoring assessment. Therefore, students earning a level 3 or higher on the FAST ELA, math, and Science will increase by 3% by May, 2023 on the Spring FAST Assessment.

**Monitoring:
Describe how
this Area of
Focus will be
monitored for
the desired
outcome.**

This focus area will be progress monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments throughout the school year. This data will be used to identify at risk students, plan for targeted instruction, and develop individual student goals.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:****Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

We will use collaborative planning to strengthen core instruction through unwrapping and stacking BEST standards, sharing of best practices and instructional strategies, and job embedded professional development.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:****Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for**

Collaborative planning provides teachers with opportunities to work together, utilizing each other strengths to enhance their own knowledge, planning, and instructional practices to improve student learning and achievement. It encourages teachers to come out of their comfort zone by sharing ideas as well as expand their knowledge by building on other's ideas. Collaborative planning provides teachers with an avenue for professional growth as they reflect and debrief with each other as they look for ways to improve their teaching craft and instructional practices.

selecting this strategy.**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Provide common planning time for each grade level to collaboratively plan with instructional coaches based on the BEST standards, progress monitoring data and targeted interventions.
2. Provide job-embedded professional development within collaborative planning sessions to grow teachers in their craft and core instruction.
3. Conduct grade level and individual data chats with teachers to analyze data for trends, targeted needs, and student goal setting.
4. Identify bottom quartile students and develop plans for targeted skill interventions.
5. Assign grade level MTSS liaisons and monthly MTSS PLCs to support each grade level with intervention resources, targeted instruction, and progress monitoring.
6. Provide parent engagement activities to promote at home strategies and skill sets for parents to assist in building their child's academic performance.

Person**Responsible**

Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Pinecrest will utilize our Literacy Coach to strengthen core instruction through coaching cycles and using the science of reading shifts to build best practices within our reading instruction. Core instruction continues to be a focus area as evident through our Spring 2022 iReady Reading scores with 45% in Kindergarten, 29% in first grade, and 24% in second grade scoring proficiency for the end of the year grade level benchmark of mid, late or above grade level. This data is evident and reflects a critical need

to strengthen our core instruction to close the gap and increase the percentage of students performing on grade level.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Pinecrest will utilize our Literacy Coach to strengthen core instruction through coaching cycles and job-embedded learning. Our Literacy Coach will facilitate book studies that focus on making students accountable while implementing a balance literacy approach within the classroom. Using our Literacy Coach to strengthen teachers' practices within their core instruction continues to be a focus area as 37% of our 3-5 students scored proficiency as evident with a Level 3 or higher on the Spring 2022 FSA ELA assessment. This data is evident and reflects a critical need to build best practices with our core instruction to increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

K-2 Students scoring proficient will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the Spring 2023 FAST/STAR ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

3-5 students scoring proficient as evident through a Level 3 or higher in ELA will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the Spring 2023 ELA FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

This focus area will be progress monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments throughout the school year as well as three times a year through FAST progress monitoring. This data will be used to identify at risk students, plan for targeted instruction, develop individual student goals, and coaching cycles for teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mobley, Denise, denise.mobley@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Pinecrest will utilize our Literacy Coach to strengthening core instruction through coaching cycle and job-embedded learning to build best practices within our reading instruction,

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

According to review of Educational Research article, "The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence", by Matthew A. Kraft, David Blazar, and Dylan Hogan provides evidence of the importance of coaching as essential component in providing professional development that facilitates improvement in growing knowledge of teacher theory and practice as well as provide teachers with tools to support student learning. Additional research found in the article, "Job-embedded Professional Learning Essential to Improving Teaching and Learning in Early Education" by Debra Pacchiano, PHD., Rebecca Klein, and Marsha Shigeyo Hawley, outlines research based evidence of the importance of job-embedded learning to increase teacher performance and student achievement. Peer Learning groups, coaching cycles, and lesson studies increase knowledge development, collaboration routines and transfer this learning to best practices in the classroom and develop highly effective teachers.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Literacy Coach will facilitate common planning sessions that supports a balance literacy approach while unwrapping the ELA BEST standards. This will include collaboration in instructional reading shifts, best practices, and vocabulary strategies within the frameworks of reading. 2. Literacy Coach will facilitate job-embedded professional development with in professional learning communities. This includes K-2 book study on Shifting the Balance and This is Balance Literacy as well as 3-5 book study on Who's doing the Work to build teacher knowledge and best practices. 3. Literacy Coach will conduct coaching cycles with teachers to provide feedback on instructional practices and next steps to enhance their instruction. 4. Conduct individual ELA teacher chats to discuss areas of strength, focus, needs and set professional goals. 5. Literacy Coach will do weekly morning show segments to highlight reading strategies and helpful hints to support student growth. 	Mobley, Denise, denise.mobley@hcps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Pinecrest promotes a positive culture for all stake holders through various initiatives. We work hard to establish a safe and caring environment where are students feel valued as individuals and comfortable to advocate for their needs. PBIS and Restorative Practices are used to promote positive change and growth with a focus on building strong relationships between academic success and social-emotional learning. We celebrate student academic and citizenship through our Super Pilot Program and award quarterly ceremonies. Each morning we start our day with our Pinecrest Pledge to remind students of rights and responsibilities to bring out the best in them. Students participate in awareness programs such as Start with Hello campaigns, ACT Now, Mental Health Matters, Monthly Cultural Awareness activities, and inclusion programs. We also provide a positive culture for parents to be involved in their child's education through PTA, family engagement activities, and as parent volunteers. Clear and frequent home communication is provided through take home folders. teacher apps such as Remind and Class Dojo, Parentlink voice, emails or texts and PTA Facebook. We collaborate with various community organizations to support our families unique needs. Through community school supply drives, we are able to provide school supplies to any student that needs assistance. We also work closely with SEEDs of Hope to provide a backpack program for families in need of food over the weekend.

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

Administration, Social Worker, Guidance Counselor, School Psychologies, Teachers, Staff, Students, Parents and Community Partners.