Hillsborough County Public Schools

Pinecrest Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pinecrest Elementary School

7950 LITHIA PINECREST RD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Denise Mobley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Provide
Instructional
Learning
Opportunities
To
Succeed

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
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	
Mobley, Denise	Principal		Administration
Cook, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair	SAC Chairperson
Turner, kellie	Teacher, K-12		Parent Involvement Liaison
	Assistant Principal		Administration

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2011, Denise Mobley

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.*
1

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
42

Total number of students enrolled at the school
567

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	87	86	89	79	100	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	13	8	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	28	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	6	5	14	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	77	88	74	106	78	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	12	12	5	18	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	9	10	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	77	88	74	106	78	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	12	12	5	18	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	9	10	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%			47%	52%	57%	50%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	34%			47%	55%	58%	44%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%			41%	50%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	39%			51%	54%	63%	44%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	36%			55%	57%	62%	50%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%			42%	46%	51%	39%	44%	47%
Science Achievement	30%			48%	50%	53%	46%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	64%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	51%	-5%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

IReady Reading and Math data was used for grades K-5 to compile this progress monitoring data below. For 5th grade Science data, we used the district baseline and midyear assessment for Fall and Winter and 2021 FCAT SSS Science test for Spring.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	35	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	28	49
	Students With Disabilities	0	27	30
	English Language Learners	0	0	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	34	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	35	54
	Students With Disabilities	13	40	62
	English Language Learners	6	13	35

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15	24	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	18	34
	Students With Disabilities	5	5	15
	English Language Learners	0	5	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	19	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	12	38
	Students With Disabilities	3	16	44
	English Language Learners	0	7	24

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	46	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	45	60
	Students With Disabilities	21	21	36
	English Language Learners	0	18	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	29	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	26	48
	Students With Disabilities	14	28	47
	English Language Learners	4	13	32

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23	34	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	27	34
	Students With Disabilities	26	44	43
	English Language Learners	6	6	9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	29	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	22	51
	Students With Disabilities	18	28	54
	English Language Learners	5	7	34

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	30	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	27	31
	Students With Disabilities	30	37	30
	English Language Learners	8	27	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	34	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	30	50
	Students With Disabilities	31	40	51
	English Language Learners	3	19	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	41	41	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	39	25
	Students With Disabilities	44	40	10
	English Language Learners	35	33	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	20			9							
ELL	25	27		17	27		7				
HSP	30	38		25	30		17				
WHT	43	31		45	38		37				
FRL	38	36	43	32	33	42	24				

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

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	35	40	37	31	40	29	29				
ELL	33	48	42	33	59	50	10				
HSP	42	46	48	36	55	45	39				
WHT	51	42	42	49	48	33	49				
FRL	41	42	45	37	46	37	41				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	325
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

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	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Strengthening our core instruction is a need based on our proficiency levels for all subgroups. In review of our subgroup data, the trends show that our ELL students perform significantly below other subgroups.

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

Core instruction continues to be a focus area for improvement as evident through our 2019 and 2021 FSA scores. In 2019 47% of our 3rd-5th graders scored at a level 3 or higher on the ELA FSA. In 2021 we see a 7% decrease with 40% scoring at a level 3 or higher. Our 2021 Math FSA also shows a decline of 12% with only 39% of 3rd-5th grade students scoring at a level 3 or higher.

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

Students entering a grade already below level has drastically impacted their on grade level performance. Although teacher differentiate for students at their lower level, there is still a need to ensure they are exposed and working on grade level concepts. This year we are implementing acceleration strategies to enhance students on grade level performance. We also need to focus on building background knowledge and vocabulary.

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

IReady data in both reading and math demonstrate that our students are making growth from Fall to Spring.

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

Increase technology and fidelity in use of iReady program through goal setting and student conferences.

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

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

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

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

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Pinecrest will focus on strengthening our core instruction through standard based planning with our instructional coaches and acceleration activities in both reading and math. In our review of our 2021 FSA our student profiecency levels in reading decreased by 7%, in math decreased by 12%, and science decreased by 18%.
Measureable Outcome:	Through the use of instructional coaching cycles and facilitation of job-embedded professional development to build best instructional practices, our student proficiency levels will increase by 3% on the 2022 FSA. As a result of these continued practices, students earning a level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA, math, and science will increase by 3% for each subject area on the Spring 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	This focus area will be progress monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments. This data will be used to establish and monitor students progress towards individualized goals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Coaching including facilitation of acceleration, standard based planning and job embedded professional development to support these areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to review of Educational Research article, “The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence”, by Matthew A. Kraft, David Blazar, and Dylan Hogan provides evidence of the importance of coaching as essential component in providing professional development that facilitates improvement in growing knowledge of teacher theory and practice as well as provide teachers with tools to support student learning. Additional research found in the article, “Job-embedded Professional Learning Essential to Improving Teaching and Learning in Early Education” by Debra Pacchiano, PHD., Rebecca Klein, and Marsha Shigeyo Hawley, outlines research based evidence of the importance of job-embedded learning to increase teacher performance and student achievement. Peer Learning groups, coaching cycles, and lesson studies increase knowledge development, collaboration routines and transfer this learning to best practices in the classroom and develop highly effective teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide common planning time for each grade level to collaboratively plan with instructional coaches based on the state standards, progress monitoring data, and need for acceleration.
2. Conduct grade level and individual data chats with teachers to analyze data for trends, targeted needs, and student goal setting.
3. Provide Coaching Cycles with teachers to improve best practices for core instruction.
4. Provide job-embedded professional development to grow teachers in their craft and core instruction.
5. Identify bottom quartile students and develop plan for differentiated interventions.
6. Assign grade level MTSS liaisons to support each grade level with target interventions, acceleration activities, and resources needed to Scaffold learning for all tiered students.
7. Provide parent engagement activities to promote at home strategies to build their child's academic progress.
8. Utilize additional technology to enhance and increase usage of academic interventions such as iReady.

Person Responsible	Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 40% of our 3-5 students scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. In addition, our ELL and SWD students scored below the federal index of 41% with ELL students at a 32% federal index and SWD at a 36% federal index. This score was due to students entering a grade already below level which impacted their on grade-level performance and showed a need for acceleration to close the existing achievement gap.
Measureable Outcome:	The percent of 3-5 students scoring proficient or at a level 3 or higher will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the 2022 FSA ELA assessment.
Monitoring:	Students progress in ELA will be progress monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments. This data will be used to set individualized goals, plan for instruction, and monitor students progress towards proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement a planning structure with ELA grade level teams in grades 3-5 that will allow them to internalize the Guiding Question and use it as a basis for backwards planning. Within these planning structures, we will Incorporate structures and strategies that encourage student discussion, ownership of work, and active engagement during their ELA block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In review of our 2021 FSA data, it showed an 7% decrease in our 3-5 students making proficiency in ELA. In addition, our overall and bottom quartile learning gains showed a decrease with a 13% decrease in our overall ELA learning gains and a 6% decrease in our bottom quartile gains. The improvement strategy of providing standard based planning structures focuses core instruction on developing rigorous and meaningful ELA lessons that are purposeful and engage students in critical thinking and reading strategies that will increase reading proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop a framework for team planning around the student end task aligned to the ELA guiding unit question and focus standards.
2. Implement reading coaching cycles around clarity of the guiding question and its relation to the daily learning targets.
3. Embed discussion strategies in common planning, coaching cycles, and professional development.
4. Literacy Coach will guide teachers in creating anchor charts they can use and refer to throughout the week to support instruction and student understanding.
5. Construct rigorous student tasks aligned to this guiding question and learning target.
6. Analyze student work and plan for additional scaffolding opportunities to accelerate core instruction for our ELL and SWD subgroups.
7. Conduct focused walk-throughs to determine trends, provide feedback on instructional practices, and plan job embedded professional development.
8. Utilize teacher leaders as models and think partners during both instruction and planning of ELA to help build teacher capacity.

Person Responsible	Denise Mobley (denise.mobley@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to 2019-2020 discipline data from SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Pinecrest ranks moderate when compared to all elementary schools statewide with a 0.5 incidents per 100 students and ranked 39th overall out of 119 in Hillsborough County. Pinecrest has implemented restorative practices towards discipline where we focus on building relationships and engage in collaborative problem solving. We have established a Super Pilot positive behavior intervention support system with students rights and responsibility outlined for success. In addition, students receive monthly guidance lessons and participate in schoolwide initiatives such as "Start with Hello", Act Now, and Mental Health Matters to foster a positive and caring environment for all to learn.

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.

Pinecrest promotes a positive culture for all stake holders through various initiatives. We work hard to establish a safe and caring environment where are students feel valued as individuals and comfortable to advocate for their needs. Restorative Practice are used to promote positive change and growth. Students participate in awareness programs such as Start with Hello campaigns, ACT Now, Mental Health Matters, Monthly Cultural Awareness activities, and inclusion programs. We also provide a positive culture for parents to be involved in their child's education through PTA, family engagement activities, and as parent volunteers. Clear and frequent home communication is provided through take home folders. teacher apps such as Remind and Class Dojo, Parentlink voice, emails or texts and PTA Facebook. We collaborate with various community organizations to support our families unique needs. Through community school supply drives, we are able to provide school supplies to any student that needs assistance. We also work closely with SEEDs of Hope to provide a backpack program for families in need of food over the weekend.

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

Administration, Social Worker, Guidance Counselor, School psychologies, Teachers, students and parents.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00