

Collier County Public Schools

Pine Ridge Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Ridge Middle School

1515 PINE RIDGE RD, Naples, FL 34109

<https://www.collierschools.com/prm>

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Gordon

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Collier 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Ridge Middle School

1515 PINE RIDGE RD, Naples, FL 34109

<https://www.collierschools.com/prm>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>66%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>48%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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 mission is to deliver an excellent education, prepare students for future challenges and opportunities, and empower all learners to achieve and succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will complete school prepared for ongoing learning as well as community and global responsibilities.

P - Prepared

R - Responsible

M - Motivated

S - Safe

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
Gordon, Michelle	Principal	Team members meet with the grade level Professional Learning Communities in which Team Leaders conduct problem solving sessions. Leadership team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and analysis. At these meetings student data is discussed, analyzed, and submitted to the appropriate district site. Data driven decisions are made and continuous student improvement is the focus of discussion. Academic as well as behavior data is reviewed. Quarterly data is utilized to monitor specific populations who need to be targeted by progress indicators. Based on data, fidelity of academic and behavioral services delivered is monitored
Coloma, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction Language Arts PLCs
Spencer, Brett	Teacher, ESE	Assist in monitoring of all SWD
higgins, jane	Reading Coach	monitoring all language arts PLCs
Vessella, Marisa	Math Coach	Assist with monitoring Math PLCs
Gonder, Scot	Administrative Support	Building safety and security
Lindenmeyer, Beth	Instructional Media	Technology support Media circulation
Badillo, Jorge	Assistant Principal	Monitors Attendance & Discipline
Schram, Pamela	School Counselor	Student placement Mental Health concerns

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/24/2022, Michelle Gordon

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.*

7

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.*

26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

833

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

15

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

9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	266	283	283	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	38	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	21	29	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	17	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	45	54	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	34	27	0	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	45	54	0	0	0	0	126
	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	

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	0	0	0	4	14	23	0	0	0	0	41

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	284	342	0	0	0	0	898
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	29	38	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	19	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	32	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	19	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	37	49	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	33	41	0	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	13	24	38	0	0	0	0	75

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

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	272	284	342	0	0	0	0	898
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	29	38	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	19	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	32	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	19	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	37	49	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	33	41	0	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	13	24	38	0	0	0	0	75

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

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%	55%	50%				78%	59%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						64%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						56%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	76%	34%	36%				83%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	66%						68%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						63%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	67%	53%				75%	55%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	64%	58%				88%	75%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	75%	56%	19%	54%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	76%	55%	21%	52%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
08	2022					
	2019	79%	58%	21%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	81%	61%	20%	55%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	81%	66%	15%	54%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	36%	22%	46%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	74%	52%	22%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	87%	72%	15%	71%	16%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	91%	67%	24%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%

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	23	36	28	39	49	43	15	41	79		
ELL	38	52	40	50	60	55	32	44	93		
ASN	86	86		90	81						
BLK	43	48	45	54	50	57		50			
HSP	55	57	38	62	62	52	55	66	90		
MUL	68	71		76	62						
WHT	80	67	41	85	68	54	82	84	92		
FRL	54	55	42	61	58	53	52	61	86		
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	27	39	29	28	39	36	19	28	63		
ELL	40	51	45	51	58	51	25	51	77		

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
ASN	71	67		88	79		50		100		
BLK	40	38		40	25	17	45				
HSP	60	59	47	65	62	51	55	65	93		
MUL	71	50		75	59						
WHT	80	65	35	83	69	47	73	90	89		
FRL	56	52	36	61	52	43	53	65	87		

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	42	53	51	50	52	49	42	59	86		
ELL	46	50	50	68	65	70	48	59	89		
ASN	85	58		95	74		93	91	100		
BLK	59	56	53	66	58	61	50	60	90		
HSP	63	59	54	75	62	64	56	78	91		
MUL	88	76		92	76			100			
WHT	86	67	59	87	71	60	85	93	93		
FRL	67	57	53	75	63	63	60	79	86		

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	65
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	654
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	58
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	69
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	73
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	57
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?

Across the board, SWD in all grade levels in core content areas continued to score below district average.

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

8th grade math has shown the greatest need for improvement.

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

This need for improvement comes from the math class continuing to decrease below average. Factors for this need was mid year personnel turnovers. New actions to improve SWD student is additional support and targeted support for 8th grade math.

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

Our greatest areas of strength were 7th grade & 8th grade ELA.

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

Those grade levels had common planning and focused on student attainment of standard to ensure student achievement.

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

Focus on student attainment of standards

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.

All stakeholders will be fully engaged in biweekly PLC's. The PLC's will be rotate through the teacher's grade level department and grade level teams. Departments will focus on common planning and common assessments. Grade Level Teams will focus on Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)

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

With the implementation of the BEST standards, all areas will focus on student attainment of these standards.

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.

Our SWD students who demonstrated proficiency decreased by 1% in ELA. A lack of additional supports for students based on human resources as well as a loss of instructional focus were contributing factors in this decline.

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

Our SWD students who demonstrate proficiency will increase by 5% in ELA.

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

Common Planning PLC monitoring tool form

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Coloma (coloma@collierschools.com)

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

Differentiated Instruction is adapting instruction in response to the distinct assessed skills and needs of individual learners in order to increase their access and opportunities to meet specific learning goals

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

Differentiated instruction contributes to the refined understanding of specific content, concepts and skills within each learner’s distinct range of understanding and independent practice that improves individual abilities to successfully engage in comprehension, fluency/decoding, letter-word reading, vocabulary and writing.

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 Teacher creates flexible structures and routines that allow for differentiation.

Person Responsible jane higgins (higgij3@collierschools.com2)

2 Teacher delivers instruction that is adapted through content, process and/or product in order to meet individual student learning needs.

Person Responsible jane higgins (higgij3@collierschools.com2)

3 Teacher monitors student understanding and progress toward meeting targeted learning goals on a continued basis

Person Responsible jane higgins (higgij3@collierschools.com2)

#2. 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.

Math SWD

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

Our 8th grade SWD students will increase by 3% in math proficiency.

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

Common Planning PLC monitoring tool form

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marisa Vessella (vessem@collierschools.com)

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

Explicit, Systematic Instruction
 Explicit, systematic instruction, sometimes simply referred to as explicit instruction, involves teaching a specific concept or procedure in a highly structured and carefully sequenced manner. Research has indicated that teaching mathematics in this manner is highly effective and can significantly improve a student’s ability to perform mathematical operations (e.g., adding, multiplying, finding the square root) as well as to solve word problems. This strategy has been shown to be effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including students with disabilities and ELLs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the

Differentiated instruction contributes to the refined understanding of specific content, concepts and skills within each learner’s distinct range of understanding and independent practice that improves individual abilities to successfully engage in comprehension, fluency/decoding, letter-word reading, vocabulary and writing.

**resources/
criteria used for
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 Teacher creates flexible structures and routines that allow for differentiation.

Person Responsible Marisa Vessella (vessem@collierschools.com)

2. Teacher delivers instruction that is adapted through content, process and/or product in order to meet individual student learning needs.

Person Responsible Marisa Vessella (vessem@collierschools.com)

3 Teacher monitors student understanding and progress toward meeting targeted learning goals on a continued basis

Person Responsible Marisa Vessella (vessem@collierschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our ELL students who demonstrated proficiency decreased by 1% in ELA. A lack of additional supports for students based on human resources as well as a loss of instructional focus were contributing factors in this decline.

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

Our ELL students will increase by 3% in proficiency.

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

Progress Monitoring Review, Cella & Wida Score

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

jane higgins (higgij3@collierschools.com2)

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

Differentiation based on student needs.

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

Differentiated instruction in a sheltered setting contributes to the refined understanding of specific content, concepts and skills within each learner’s distinct range of understanding and independent practice that improves individual abilities to successfully engage in comprehension, fluency/ decoding, letter-word reading, vocabulary and writing.

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 Teacher creates flexible structures and routines that allow for differentiation.

Person Responsible Beth Lindenmeyer (lindenbe@collierschools.com)

2 Teacher delivers instruction that is adapted through content, process and/or product in order to meet individual student learning needs.

Person Responsible jane higgins (higgij3@collierschools.com2)

3 Teacher monitors student understanding and progress toward meeting targeted learning goals on a continued basis

Person Responsible jane higgins (higgij3@collierschools.com2)

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.

Pine Ridge Middle School strives to acknowledge the successes of the school and celebrate the unique diversity of the all stakeholders involved. Whether be looking at how each student is scheduled with purpose; while not only looking at student test scores but strategically scheduled students based on ELL & ESE Eligibility.

Pine Ridge also fosters a positive behavior environment through our school culture. Respect is part of our PBIS Acronym and we fully believe it starts at the top down. Administration must model and show this based on how we treat one another. This is accomplished through regular communications to all stakeholder groups, recognition of the success of students and teachers, and constantly adapting practices based on feedback. Administration has created a PBIS team to help gather ideas and enhance positive school culture. Stomp out bullying is part of this year's PBIS theme.

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

Administration, Leadership, & PBIS Teams.