

Orange County Public Schools

# Pinewood Elementary



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Pinewood Elementary

3005 N APOPKA VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://pinewoodes.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Kelly Steinke**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: D (34%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	TIER 1
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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](http://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**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

#### **Provide the school's vision statement**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Steinke, Kelly	Principal	The Principal serves as an instructional leader at Pinewood Elementary. She assists and observes teachers with data-based decision making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. She meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier II as well as Tier III. The Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Earnest, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	The Curriculum Resource Teacher provides and leads professional development for core curriculum areas. She identifies systematic patterns of student and teacher needs and coaches teachers on instructional best practices. The CRT participates in data collection, progress monitoring, as well as data meetings to monitor student assessment results.
Beckett, Kimberli	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components, supports teachers with science and social studies instruction, coaches teachers daily, and facilitates data collection for grades K-5. She provides activities and administers Tier III instruction to groups of students who have been identified through data analysis. In addition, the Instructional Coach conducts professional development with the faculty to ensure that best practices in all areas of instruction are utilized in both whole group and small group instruction.
Leighvard, Autherene	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves with the Principal as an instructional leader at Pinewood. She assists and observes teachers with data-based decision making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. She meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier II as well as TIER III. The Assistant Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Bartolotta, Kelly	Other	The Staffing Specialist assists in decision making for intervention/enrichment and leads MTSS Problem Solving meetings, eligibility and IEP team meetings to ensure students have a plan in place for their success.
Teague, Suzanne	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components, supports teachers with science and social studies instruction, coaches teachers daily, and facilitates data collection for grades K-5. She provides activities and administers Tier III instruction to

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		groups of students who have been identified through data analysis. In addition, the Instructional Coach conducts professional development with the faculty to ensure that best practices in all areas of instruction are utilized in both whole group and small group instruction.
Mendonca, Marceline	Instructional Coach	<p>The Instructional Coach provides guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components, supports teachers with science and social studies instruction, coaches teachers daily, and facilitates data collection for grades K-5.</p> <p>She provides activities and administers Tier III instruction to groups of students who have been identified through data analysis. In addition, the Instructional Coach conducts professional development with the faculty to ensure that best practices in all areas of instruction are utilized in both whole group and small group instruction.</p>

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/11/2019, Kelly Steinke

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

43

**Demographic Data**

<p><b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Elementary School PK-5</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p>	<p>K-12 General Education</p>
<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>

<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: D (34%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	TIER 1
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

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



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	22	85	98	73	119	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	492
Attendance below 90 percent	3	16	24	19	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	26	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

**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	24	35	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

**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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 6/8/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	67	96	73	127	101	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	18	13	13	12	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	49	11	2	21	24	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	63	39	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153

**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	12	2	1	26	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	67	96	73	127	101	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	18	13	13	12	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	49	11	2	21	24	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	63	39	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153

**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	12	2	1	26	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	34%	57%	57%	41%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	58%	58%	51%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	52%	53%	45%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	38%	63%	63%	43%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	38%	61%	62%	48%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	48%	51%	56%	46%	47%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	37%	56%	53%	58%	55%	55%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	31%	55%	-24%	58%	-27%
	2018	30%	55%	-25%	57%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	57%	-20%	58%	-21%
	2018	37%	54%	-17%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	35%	54%	-19%	56%	-21%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
	2018	44%	61%	-17%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	63%	-21%	64%	-22%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	28%	57%	-29%	60%	-32%
	2018	29%	59%	-30%	61%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	54%	-19%	53%	-18%
	2018	47%	53%	-6%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	11	33	17	16	15		30				
ELL	31	44	29	40	42	38	26				
BLK	31	37	25	34	34	28	33				
HSP	41	49	20	44	46		50				
FRL	31	41	21	36	37	27	35				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	15	32		27	33						
ELL	40	54	46	37	46	55	52				
BLK	36	48	45	40	49	57	58				
HSP	50	55		48	40		53				
FRL	39	51	50	42	48	58	57				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	290
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

#### Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Pinewood Elementary's lowest performing data component was proficiency among the lowest 25% in English Language Arts. In the 2017-2018 school year, 45% of the students in the lowest 25 percentile made learning gains. In 2018-2019, 23% of the lowest 25 percentile made learning gains. This indicates a 22% decrease in learning gains.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the lowest 25% in math. In the 2017-2018 school year, 56% of the students in the lowest 25 percentile made learning gains. In 2018-2019, 29% of the lowest 25 percentile made learning gains. This indicates a 27% decrease in learning gains.

#### Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was the lowest 25th percentile for English language arts. 23 percent of students were proficient in this area at Pinewood as opposed to 53% at the state level. This is a gap of 30%.

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Based on the data, there was no improvement shown in any component.

#### Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on the EWS data, we have identified two potential areas of concern: course failure in ELA or Math and Level 1 on statewide assessments.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year**

1. Lowest 25% learning gains (ELA & Math)
2. ELA proficiency
3. Math learning gains
4. Science proficiency
5. Math proficiency

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in Reading and Mathematics was identified as a critical need based on data analysis. Thirty-four percent of our students demonstrated proficiency on reading standards, and 38% of our students demonstrated proficiency on mathematics standards. In addition, proficiency in the area of science is a critical need, as 37% of our students scored at the proficient level.

**Measureable Outcome:**

By implementing evidence-based strategies, we anticipate seeing proficiency at Pinewood Elementary increase by at least 7 percentage points from 34% to 41% in English Language Arts, from 38% to 45% in mathematics, and from 37% to 44% in science.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Strategies that we will implement include increasing the rigor of standards-based instruction through engagement and processing strategies, structured team planning, and using assessments to drive instruction. Formative assessment data will be utilized to monitor the effectiveness of the selected strategies. In addition, coaches will be present during team planning sessions to monitor the development of rigorous standards-based lessons that include engagement and processing strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Standards-based instruction is key to increasing student achievement. Through structured team planning we will be able to collectively determine what students need to know and be able to do in order to achieve the standards. All standards-based lessons begin with a well-developed plan. Through team planning, teachers' capacity will increase through collaboration and the support of instructional leaders. To determine if our standards-based instruction is working we will utilize formative assessment data. Outcomes from the formative assessment data will drive our instruction. Finally, we will utilize standards-based instructional strategies including engagement and processing strategies to improve student achievement. These high-yield strategies will be incorporated into daily lessons.

**Action Steps to Implement**

We will train teachers on the use of Kagan engagement strategies in all subject areas to increase student focus and understanding.

**Person Responsible**

Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@ocps.net)

We will train teachers on the use of Thinking Maps for use in all subject areas to aid with student processing. Training will occur at the beginning of the year, then be infused in weekly PLC meetings.

**Person Responsible**

Jennifer Earnest (jennifer.earnest@ocps.net)

We will continue to use Fontas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System to accurately identify students' needs. Updated training will be provided at the beginning of the year for all teachers.



**Person Responsible** Jennifer Earnest (jennifer.earnest@ocps.net)

We will provide tutoring, in addition to the extra hour of instruction, to students in 3rd-5th grades focused on ELA, Math, and Science.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Earnest (jennifer.earnest@ocps.net)

We will continue utilizing structured PLC sessions, with a focus on planning rigorous standards-based instruction.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@ocps.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Increasing proficiency in students' performance in both reading and mathematics was identified as a critical need based on data analysis. Thirty-four percent of our students demonstrated proficiency on reading standards, and 38% of our students demonstrated proficiency on mathematics standards. By focusing on differentiated small group instruction, we can ensure that our students are receiving rigorous instruction tailored to their individual needs.

**Measureable Outcome:** By implementing evidence-based strategies, we anticipate seeing proficiency at Pinewood Elementary increase by at least 7 percentage points from 34% to 41% in English Language Arts, and from 38% to 45% in mathematics.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Strategies that we will implement include differentiating instruction, continuing the data analysis, and incorporating an extra hour of reading instruction. We will closely monitor these strategies to determine their effectiveness by meeting every six weeks to examine student data (progress monitoring data, formative assessment data, and diagnostic data). Small group and extra hour instruction will be monitored weekly via classroom walkthroughs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Differentiating instruction is key to increasing performance among all students. Through the data analysis process, we will collectively determine how students are progressing on the standards. By implementing an extra hour of reading, students will receive differentiated instruction targeted to meet their individual needs. These research-based strategies will lead to an increase in student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

We will evaluate student academic performance through the data analysis process (Child Chats). These meetings will take place every 6-8 weeks.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Bartolotta (kelly.bartolotta@ocps.net)

Once students' needs have been determined, differentiated small group instruction will be implemented using standards-based lessons and multiple interventions. Interventions will be progress monitored either weekly or bi-weekly in order to determine the effectiveness of the intervention.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@ocps.net)

We will train teachers on effective strategies to implement within differentiated small group lessons. Training will take place throughout the year in PLC sessions.

**Person Responsible** Suzanne Teague (suzanne.teague@ocps.net)

We will monitor the instruction and provide teachers with timely and actionable feedback.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@ocps.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Social Emotional Learning instruction is essential to enhancing our students' ability to succeed both in school and in life. Students that receive SEL instruction are shown to have increased academic achievement, greater motivation to learn, and reduced emotional distress. Pinewood Elementary is dedicated to ensuring that our students have a safe and positive learning environment in order to become successful citizens.

**Measureable Outcome:** In order to measure the effectiveness of the SEL instruction, we will do a pre and post test during the school year. By implementing the SEL curriculum with fidelity, we anticipate seeing an increase in students' emotional growth throughout the year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will continue to utilize the research-based Sanford Harmony SEL curriculum, with a focus on strengthening teachers' knowledge of the program. In addition, we will implement Conscious Discipline strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Sanford Harmony and Conscious Discipline are proven, research-based programs that focus on increasing students' social and emotional growth. These programs are designed to give children the tools that they need to manage their behavior, make responsible decisions, empathize with peers, feel safe and secure in their learning environment, and increase their motivation to learn.

**Action Steps to Implement**

We will continue to utilize the Sanford Harmony SEL curriculum. Our school psychologist will provide training at the beginning of the year to ensure that all staff members are clear on the implementation procedures. Lessons will be monitored and feedback will be provided to teachers.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@ocps.net)

Staff will be trained on Conscious Discipline strategies in order to provide students with an array of tools to monitor and regulate their behavior choices and emotions.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Bartolotta (kelly.bartolotta@ocps.net)

Lesson plans focused on common rules/procedures, building community, and creating a safe learning environment will be created for the staff. Lessons will focus on using common language so students are receiving a coherent message across all areas of the campus.

**Person Responsible** Autherene Leighvard (autherene.leighvard@ocps.net)

We will attend the DPLC training, which is focused on SEL strategies, and provide professional development to the staff.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@ocps.net)

We will implement a House System to create a strong sense of community and belonging. Students will be grouped into Houses and work collaboratively with their House Members

toward common goals. Houses will also meet periodically throughout the year in order to build bonds among members of the group.

**Person Responsible** Marceline Mendonca (marceline.mendonca@ocps.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Through the monitoring of our action steps in our Areas of Focus, our remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (course failure in ELA/Math and Level 1s on FSA) will be addressed.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Pinewood Elementary strives to create a positive, supportive, and inclusive learning environment in order to meet both the educational and social-emotional needs of our students. We collaborate with all stakeholders, including our faculty and staff, parents, PTA, School Advisory Committee (SAC), and community members in order to create strategies that lead our students to success.

The PTA's goal is to foster a nurturing and caring environment that aims for continued parent involvement in helping build a better educational environment for our children. Pinewood PTA's goal this year, along with SAC, is to promote a school community where teachers and administrators can do their best work with the resources we can provide and help make school fun. Through membership dues and fundraising efforts, the PTA will be able to implement various educational and family oriented programs for the staff, students and parents throughout this school year.

For the PTA to be effective and truly representative of the school, it is essential to have parental involvement from as many parents as possible. Many working parents feel that they

cannot be included in the PTA because they cannot come to every meeting or be on campus during the school day; however, the goal is to ensure that all parents have an opportunity to participate in several activities throughout the school year. Many activities will be held during the evening hours to ensure a larger participation of parents in school sponsored activities. When parents volunteer they get the opportunity to enjoy interacting with their students.

The Pinewood PTA is striving for 100% participation from our Pinewood families, faculty, and staff. Every child needs to be represented at Pinewood. This means every parent and teacher needs to become a member and be involved. PTA meetings are held on the second Tuesday of the month at 6:00 PM in the media center.

A Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) is purchased with Title I funds to serve as a liaison to bridge the gap between school and home. She advocates for the parents and encourages their involvement in all school activities.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Part V: Budget**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$133,283.85
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG	1.76	\$84,700.00
			<i>Notes: 2 Resource teachers for intervention in the classroom</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$8,470.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement benefits for 2 Resource teachers for intervention in the classroom</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$6,479.55
			<i>Notes: Social Security benefits for 2 Resource teachers for intervention in the classroom</i>			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$18,577.20
			<i>Notes: Health Insurance benefits for 2 Resource teachers for intervention in the classroom</i>			
	5100	232-Life Insurance	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$59.80
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance benefits for 2 Resource teachers for intervention in the classroom</i>			

	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$279.51
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation benefits for 2 Resource teachers for intervention in the classroom</i>			
	5100	250-Unemployment Compensation	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$22.87
			<i>Notes: Unemployment Compensation benefits for 2 Resource teachers for intervention in the classroom</i>			
	5100	290-Other Employee Benefits	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$1,811.73
			<i>Notes: Other Employee benefits for 2 Resource teachers for intervention in the classroom</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$12,883.19
			<i>Notes: Supplies 5%</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction</b>				<b>\$110,826.79</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	160-Other Support Personnel	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG	2.0	\$69,969.60
			<i>Notes: 2 Program Assistants for the classroom</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$6,996.96
			<i>Notes: Retirement benefits for 2 Program Assistants for the classroom</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$5,352.67
			<i>Notes: Social Security benefits for 2 Program Assistants for the classroom</i>			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$18,577.20
			<i>Notes: Health Insurance benefits for 2 Program Assistants for the classroom</i>			
	5100	232-Life Insurance	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$49.40
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance benefits for 2 Program Assistants for the classroom</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$230.90
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation benefits for 2 Program Assistants for the classroom</i>			
	5100	250-Unemployment Compensation	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$18.89
			<i>Notes: Unemployment Compensation benefits for 2 Program Assistants for the classroom</i>			
	5100	290-Other Employee Benefits	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$1,496.65
			<i>Notes: Other Employee benefits for 2 Program Assistants for the classroom</i>			

	5100	510-Supplies	0401 - Pinewood Elementary	UniSIG		\$8,134.52
			<i>Notes: Leveled Book Sets for Differentiated Instruction</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Social Emotional Learning</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$257,663.75</b>