

Escambia County School District

Pine Meadow Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Meadow Elementary School

10001 OMAR AVE, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Morris R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Meadow Elementary School

10001 OMAR AVE, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

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 KG-5	Yes	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our School Mission at Pine Meadow Elementary is to provide high levels of learning in a culture of collaboration and respect between students, faculty, staff, and parents. We will achieve and gain a sense of purpose through hard work, kindness, and high expectations in a safe and positive learning environment. We are united for all students to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Greenberg, Elizabeth	Principal	
Hale, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
Chism, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	
Garrison, Pamela	Teacher, ESE	
Lassiter, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
Garic, Tara	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Potter, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Schlauder, Tina	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/9/2019, Dawn Morris R

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.*

3

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

712

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

14

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

11

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	99	129	126	121	108	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	708
Attendance below 90 percent	13	34	24	17	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	1	1	6	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	2	3	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	25	44	10	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	1	3	3	3	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	6	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/22/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	8	9	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	8	9	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	69%	51%	56%				64%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						58%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						52%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	66%	46%	50%				67%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						60%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						41%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	52%	59%				57%	54%	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	71%	56%	15%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

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	67%	55%	12%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	58%	22%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	55%	-2%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	56%	55%	1%	53%	3%
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	22	35	35	43	58	59	17				
BLK	53	70	55	35	60	64	17				
HSP	80			70							
MUL	65	73		64	36						
WHT	73	63	41	74	68	59	65				
FRL	59	64	41	54	69	58	49				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	21	30		27	20		20				
BLK	42	31		34	6		19				
HSP	73	82		59	45		82				
MUL	71			65							
WHT	71	58	55	64	50	36	58				
FRL	52	50	33	50	40	28	40				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	37	47	50	43	37	21	26				
BLK	43	43	50	48	49	29	33				
HSP	60	54		72	46		64				
MUL	79	80		65	69						
WHT	71	60	42	72	62	48	62				
FRL	60	54	48	60	53	39	43				

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	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	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	75
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	63
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	56
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?

School Data-Lowest performance is proficiency within our SWD Subgroup in ELA. In 2022, SWD scored 22% proficient, which falls below the threshold of 41% and is a trend that we have seen for the past three years. Science proficiency, when compared with 2021 data, shows a slight increase from 53% to 58%, however we were still above the State proficiency level of 53% in 2019.

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

We still have room to improve our Science proficiency. Although we are at 58% proficient, that number falls below our proficiency levels in ELA and Math. We also need to continue our focus on the SWD subgroup to increase their proficiency, especially in ELA.

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

Increasing the Science proficiency scores could be achieved by having students complete lessons on Study Island, which is an interactive learning platform which supports Florida's Science curriculum. Study Island has been proven through research to be an effective tool for test score improvements. A study was conducted in 2008 that supports the overall effectiveness of Study Island in impacting student achievement in a positive manner.

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

ELA proficiency increased from 64% in 2019 to 69% in 2022, which places Pine Meadow well above the state average of 57% proficient. Science proficiency also increased from 57% in 2019 to 58% in 2022 and was one areas of focus from our 2021 SIP.

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

Teachers spent time focusing on the data and providing small group instruction to target areas of student need. They utilized iReady lessons and standards mastery to check and assess student proficiency within the ELA standards. Science gains came from increasing student opportunities to complete hands-on labs, allowing them to dig deeper into the standards and enable student understanding.

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

Teachers can utilize iReady standards based assessments and change pathways to accelerate learning. In small groups, students can work independently on teacher assigned materials, which will allow students to focus on specific standards needed for proficiency in Math and ELA.

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.

Teachers will be provided opportunities to disseminate data with team members and work with professionals at Curriculum Associates to best utilize iReady data and formulate small groups. Additionally, teachers will be provided teacher plan days to attend district trainings which will strengthen core knowledge of ELA, Math, or Science curriculum.

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

Teachers will continue to receive plan days to collaborate with their grade level colleagues, at least three times per school year. In addition, the district provides additional training throughout the school year to meet the needs of teachers and students via online classes, in person trainings, and through FDLRS.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA for students with disabilities is the lowest area of performance (22%), which increased 1% from 2021 data, but remains below the state average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the percentage of students with disabilities showing proficiency in Reading/ELA to 41%.

Monitoring:

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

Create subgroups within iReady and Accelerated Reader to include all students with disabilities in grades 3-5 to better track progress within computer assisted programs and independent reading, which have been proven to increase proficiency levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Plan ELA academic learning time and rigor of activities proportionate to the student's academic needs, utilizing computer assisted instruction and increasing independent reading time across all genres, specifically nonfiction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Ensure needs of students are being met through small group instruction. Strengthen Tier 1 and utilize decision tree to determine evidence based interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Although there has been growth in this area, our school is performing just above the state average. Students below proficiency need to make gains each year and those at proficiency need to maintain and show growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the percentage of students reaching proficiency to 70%, with an increased focus on the SWD subgroup reaching a proficiency of 41%.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs, coaching, collaborative planning, and professional development will focus on standards-based lesson planning, differentiated small group instruction taking place in the classroom, as well as looking at how closely classroom activities align to the standards being taught. We can create subgroups within iReady to monitor proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Extend mathematics academic learning time proportionate to the student's academic needs

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

All students receive 60 minutes of math instruction daily. The SWD subgroup of students will require not only more time for instruction but strategic and targeted based on their needs.

* To become proficient in the application of newly acquired skills and strategies, students with the most intensive instructional needs will need multiple opportunities to practice with immediate high-quality feedback. With one-on-one and small-group instruction, teachers can provide immediate and individualized feedback.

* Students with intensive needs require substantial supports during the initial stages of learning. As students progress in their understanding and knowledge, these supports are gradually withdrawn so that students can begin to apply skills and strategies independently.

* Teachers can optimize limited instructional time and instruction by teaching skills or strategies that reinforce each other.

Action Steps to Implement

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. Targeted small groups will be identified and assigned specific curriculum targets based on progress monitoring data through out the school year.
2. Data will be reviewed after each progress monitoring period and small group and instructional targets will be adjusted based on current data.

3. Walkthroughs during small group math instruction to calibrate the lens for math expectations.
4. Tutoring for specific groups of students based on students will be offered.
5. Curriculum Night with Math Focus offered in the fall for parents, students, and teachers.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfi.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

According to school data, Science scores did not make a significant increase between 2021 and 2022. Scores raised from 53% to 58%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase percentage of students achieving science proficiency to 65%.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs will be utilized to ensure students are engaged in hands-on experiments and integrating writing activities into the science block to ensure a deeper understanding of the content.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Use of claim, evidence, and reasoning (CER) writing within science instruction to justify understanding of science standards after experiments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Moving from knowledge of content to understanding and application of knowledge.

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. Will review data with teachers to ensure curriculum is aligned to standards and remediation occurs as necessary.
2. Set up and ensure use of STEAM labs to enhance the hands on experience and science lab instruction.
3. Utilize CER writing within Science Instruction
4. Utilize Eureka Science Kits, which incorporate nonfiction science-based text to increase proficiency.
5. Study Island will be used to increase standards mastery of grade level science skills.
6. Early release days will be used K-5 to enhance science curriculum with activities and labs.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfi.us)

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.

A written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) in collaboration with parents, community stakeholders, and school personnel responsible for implementing the plan. The PFEP will assess the previous year's PFEP results and current needs. The plan will outline goals, strategies, and activities to better communicate with families and will focus on building the capacity of parents to address the needs of all students, in particular those most at-risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards. The PFEP will be reviewed by District Title 1 office and the reviewed plan will be disseminated to parents and stakeholders. A family-School Compact will also be developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders. The school's Title 1 budget will directly support the PFEP.

Students are encouraged and celebrated as they meet academic goals in ELA and Math. They are also recognized for their successes as a school leaders and role-models through various student of the month awards and activities.

Teachers are also recognized for the positive role they play in student learning. Monthly teacher and staff celebrations build a positive school culture. Mrs. Greenberg and Ms. Hale complete daily walkthroughs and provide positive feedback, along with growth strategies to assist with classroom instruction and curricular alignment.

Each week, classes compete for prizes by wearing their Pine Meadow T-shirts. PTA provides a weekly "Spirit Day" prize to the class with the highest participation, which enhances school culture and environment.

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

Pine Meadow works closely with the community and has worked to build positive culture through teacher donations at the school level. Teacher manipulatives, supplies, and games for the classroom are always a welcome and necessary tool to maximize student engagement and learning gains. We are hoping to be awarded several grants that will build a partnership between secondary CTE programs and Pine Meadow. We look forward to our Day of Caring with Navy Federal, and enjoy our volunteers from the Senior "Grandma" Program.

Publix has always been a great community partner sending food and money donations for teacher and student snacks throughout the year.

PTA works diligently to promote positive school culture. They sponsor teacher and student breakfasts, lunches, and activities, as well as supporting teachers with organizing classroom materials.