

Orange County Public Schools

Pinar Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Pinar Elementary

3701 ANTHONY LN, Orlando, FL 32822

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

Demographics

Principal: Joscelyn Gladden

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2016

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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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 White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 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.

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
Harold Gladden, Joscelyn	Principal	The principal oversees the total school operation.
Green, Adrian	Assistant Principal	Assists with overseeing the total school operation.
Williams, Ranell	Other	The resource teacher facilitates common planning sessions as well as the implementation and monitoring of core math and science instruction.
Gangwisch, Mary	Other	Monitors Tier III behavior intervention, works in partnership with the school social worker, primary contact for SEDNET, and coordinates and oversees ESE/ESY program/staffing/IEP/Revaluations/504, Matrix, Audits.
Sales, Kathleen	Other	Facilitates and monitors Tier II and Tier III intervention instruction, and ESE compliance. Oversees the VE/SLD model implementation and instruction K-5
Hamilton, Melinda	Other	Supports classroom teachers and serves as the point of contact for new teachers and mentors. Facilitates and monitors the implementation of ELA instruction along with ESOL compliance.
Patel, Dayna	Guidance Counselor	The Guidance Counselor will provide individual and group student counselor, facilitate the Threat Assessment Team meetings, assist students with personal, social and emotional needs, and assist teachers in developing and implementing classroom strategies to support student needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/15/2016, Joscelyn Gladden

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Demographic Data

2020-21 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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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 White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	44	54	59	62	62	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	13	15	14	20	11	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	1	0	3	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Wednesday 7/15/2020

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	58	63	55	61	64	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	16	17	9	19	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	5	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	19	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	4	3	0	13	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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

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	58	63	55	61	64	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	16	17	9	19	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	5	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	19	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	4	3	0	13	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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

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	57%	57%	57%	54%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	58%	58%	56%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	52%	53%	63%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	64%	63%	63%	64%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	56%	61%	62%	60%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	24%	48%	51%	42%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	52%	56%	53%	45%	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	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	58%	-5%
	2018	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	62%	-7%	62%	-7%
	2018	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	63%	-6%	64%	-7%
	2018	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	67%	57%	10%	60%	7%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	53%	-5%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	20	53	60	37	48	31	31				
ELL	58	65	61	68	68	33	64				
BLK	53	50		41	25						
HSP	57	69	65	66	62	33	51				
WHT	57	69		57	46						
FRL	57	64	62	60	52	24	50				

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	17	59	69	50	59						
ELL	40	54	58	56	58	35	28				
BLK	21			43							
HSP	54	58	62	66	60	42	45				
WHT	61	46		65	69						
FRL	52	55	61	62	57	38	44				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	42
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	59
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	
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	57
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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

The data component showing the lowest performance was Math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile of students with a decrease of 18 percentage points, from 42% to 24%. Contributing factors included, all 4th grade teachers were new to the grade level and unfamiliar with the curriculum and strategies to meet the needs of students. Although slightly above the 41% threshold the ESSA Federal Index shows that students with disabilities (43%) and Black students (42%) are lower in comparison to the other ESSA components.

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

The data component showing the lowest performance was Math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile of students with a decrease of 18 percentage points, from 42% to 24%. Contributing factors included all 4th grade teachers were new to the grade level and unfamiliar with the curriculum and strategies to meet the needs of students.

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 showing the lowest performance when compared to the state average was Math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile of students which was 27 percentage points lower than the state average. Contributing factors included all 4th grade teachers were new to the grade level and unfamiliar with the curriculum and strategies to meet the needs of students.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was ELA learning gains for all students with an increase of 9 percentage points, from 56% to 65%. Actions taken in this area included ongoing progress monitoring and using data to identify resources for fluid small group instruction. Continued professional development on close reading strategies including the implementation of text-dependent questions (TDQs) that were aligned to the standards, and assigning tutors and paraprofessionals to work with targeted students.

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

Our two areas of concern are student attendance below 90 percent (96 students) and students scoring level 1 on statewide assessments (39 students).

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

1. Math learning gains for all students with emphasis on the lowest 25th percentile.
2. Math proficiency
3. ELA learning gains for all students with emphasis on the lowest 25th percentile
4. ELA Proficiency
5. To increase the ESSA Federal Index for students with disabilities (currently 43%), and Black students (currently 42%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Focus: Increase ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile of students as well as ELA learning gains for all students through an increased focus on vocabulary and text-dependent writing.

Rationale: FSA data indicated an increase of three percentage points in ELA proficiency, from 54% to 57%. ELA learning gains for all students increased by nine percentage points, from 56% to 65%. ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile increased by five percentage points from 63% to 68%.

Measureable Outcome:

The measurable outcome we plan to achieve is to increase ELA proficiency by 3 percentage points, from 57% to 60%, increase ELA learning gains by 5% from 65% to 70%, and increase ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile of students by 2 percentage points, from 68% to 70%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joscelyn Harold Gladden (joscelyn.haroldgladden@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The i-Ready diagnostic assessments will be used to identify deficiencies. In addition to intervention instruction weekly i-Ready data along with formative assessment data will be used to measure growth. Students in the lowest 25th percentile will be monitored through the MTSS process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Ongoing progress monitoring of student data will document student growth as well as the effectiveness of instruction and next steps for intervention. Student growth will also be measured through i-Ready diagnostic and weekly online instruction data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The school site SELL team will attend scheduled training sessions and identify next steps for professional development and school-wide implementation as we continue the implementation of close reading strategies and text-dependent writing during ELA instruction.

Person Responsible

Adrian Green (adrian.green@ocps.net)

2. Ongoing progress monitoring and MTSS data will be used to determine the effectiveness of instruction and identify resources and strategies for instruction, intervention, and enrichment.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

3. Common lesson planning sessions will focus on the implementation of resources and critical thinking strategies for small group and differentiated center activities.

Person Responsible

Adrian Green (adrian.green@ocps.net)

4. The Instructional Coach and Leadership Team members will visit classrooms to observe classroom instruction of standards and strategies and provide actionable feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

5. Ongoing progress monitoring using i-Ready and formative assessment data to identify professional development needs to support fluid and differentiated student groups.

Person Responsible Adrian Green (adrian.green@ocps.net)

6. Identified students will be invited to tutoring.

Person Responsible Adrian Green (adrian.green@ocps.net)

7. Continue implementing culturally responsive instructional strategies while working to reduce bias and close the achievement gap.

Person Responsible Adrian Green (adrian.green@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description: Increase math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile of students as well as math learning gains for all students.

Description and Rationale: Rationale: Math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile of students decreased by 18 percentage points in 2019 from 42% to 24%. Math learning gains for all students decreased by 4 percentage points in 2019, from 60% to 56%.

Measureable Outcome: The measurable outcome we plan to achieve is to increase learning gains from 24% to 50% for the lowest 25th percentile of students and from 56% to 60% for all students, as a result of students increasing their ability to use close reading strategies along with a variety of problem-solving strategies to solve math word problems. We will also focus on increasing math fluency as well as math vocabulary knowledge. An overall increase in proficiency will occur for math achievement from 64% to 67%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joscelyn Harold Gladden (joscelyn.haroldgladden@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students in the lowest 25th percentile will be monitored through the MTSS process. The i-Ready diagnostic assessments will be used to identify deficiencies. In addition to intervention instruction weekly i-Ready data along with formative assessment data will be used to measure growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Ongoing progress monitoring of student data will document student growth as well as the effectiveness of instruction and next steps for intervention. Student growth will also be measured through i-Ready diagnostic and weekly online instruction data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ongoing progress monitoring using i-Ready and formative assessment data to identify professional development needs to support fluid and differentiated student groups.

Person Responsible Joscelyn Harold Gladden (joscelyn.haroldgladden@ocps.net)

2. Common lesson planning sessions will focus on the implementation of resources and problem-solving strategies for small group and differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Ranell Williams (ranell.williams@ocps.net)

3. Continue implementing Culturally Responsive instructional strategies while working to reduce bias and close the achievement gap.

Person Responsible Joscelyn Harold Gladden (joscelyn.haroldgladden@ocps.net)

4. Math Club for students predicted to score levels 1 and 2 in Math. This group includes the lowest 25th percentile of students.

Person Responsible Ranell Williams (ranell.williams@ocps.net)

5. Monitor subgroup data with a focus on the ESE (currently 43%) and Black students (currently 42%) to increase the ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index.

Person Responsible Adrian Green (adrian.green@ocps.net)

6. Math Coach and Leadership Team members will visit classrooms to observe classroom instruction of standards and strategies and provide actionable feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible Ranell Williams (ranell.williams@ocps.net)

7. Implement Social Emotional Learning (SEL) competencies to engage students in working collaboratively using a variety of problem-solving strategies.

Person Responsible Ranell Williams (ranell.williams@ocps.net)

8. Identified students will be invited to tutoring sessions.

Person Responsible Ranell Williams (ranell.williams@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Focus: As a Cohort 8 school digital devices will be provided for all students.

Description and Rationale: Rationale: Teachers and students will need training on the Canvas platform and other digital tools to ensure effective use of the new technology to positively impact student achievement.

Measureable Outcome: All teachers will be able to use the Canvas platform for student instruction, assignments, parent interaction, and school-wide communication.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joscelyn Harold Gladden (joscelyn.haroldgladden@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use formative assessment data along with i-Ready online instruction data to to measure student growth in ELA and Math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Ongoing progress monitoring of student data will document student growth as well as the impact of the use of Canvas and other digital tools.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in Canvas training and implement the strategies learned in their classrooms.

Person Responsible Joscelyn Harold Gladden (joscelyn.haroldgladden@ocps.net)

Teachers and students will learn to use a variety of digital tools such as Big Blue Button (BBB), Nearpod, and FlipGrid to enhance all modalities of instruction.

Person Responsible Adrian Green (adrian.green@ocps.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Description: Pinar Elementary will build and establish a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to academic content. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning we will address students with attendance below 90%, the lowest 25% of students in math and ELA, along with students referred to the Threat Assessment Team. During the 2019-2020 school year there were 15 threats to others, 1 Baker Act, and 22 students were monitored through the Threat Assessment Team. This data indicates a need for our students to have greater self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skill and responsible decision making.

Cognia survey results for Indicator 4.6: The school provides support services to meet the physical, social and emotional needs of the student population being served increased from 4.77 in 2019 to 4.89 in 2020 which exceeds the district average of 4.63.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2020-2021 school year we will decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance and the number of students monitored by the Threat Assessment Team by 25%, and increase learning gains of the lowest 25% of students in ELA and math by at least 3 percentage points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dayna Patel (dayna.patel@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of the school. Through distributive leadership our team will collectively support positive change through the implementation of continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Our Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) team will attend scheduled professional development sessions and provide training and opportunities for safe practice as we monitor data to determine the impact on student growth and development.

Person Responsible

Joscelyn Harold Gladden (joscelyn.haroldgladden@ocps.net)

We will establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning within our school with adults and students.

Person Responsible

Dayna Patel (dayna.patel@ocps.net)

We will implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school culture and climate.

Person Responsible Joscelyn Harold Gladden (joscelyn.haroldgladden@ocps.net)

We will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, classroom observation data, and Threat Assessment Team data. We will modify our action plan as needed to support student and staff needs.

Person Responsible Dayna Patel (dayna.patel@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We plan to continue the following school initiatives: National Elementary Honor Society, Book Club, Math Club, STEM Club, Garden Club, Battle of the Books Team, OCPS 4th Grade Math Bee, and the Pinar ES Kg and 1st Grade Sight Word Bees. (Club Sponsors)

The Staffing Specialist will provide professional development of BPIE indicators 3-oversee best practices for inclusive education and 9-ensure that person first language is used in written and verbal communication. (Staffing Specialist-Mary Gangwisch)

Leadership Team members will provide professional development sessions to build teacher capacity in implementing instructional strategies for differentiated small group instruction. (Leadership Team)

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.

Pinar Elementary promotes and works to maintain a supportive school culture and nurturing environment that meets the needs of our students and stakeholders. Our Title I Parental

Engagement Liaison (PEL) works to establish positive relationships with parents, bridge communication gaps due to language, and to increase parental engagement in the school. Each year parents are invited to attend monthly parent workshops, curriculum nights, student performances, award ceremonies, as well as PTA events. Attendance is documented for all parenting events. Parents are invited to monthly SAC meetings and encouraged to join PTA. Parents are encouraged to participate in a variety of volunteer opportunities throughout the school year. Our PEL is also instrumental in establishing partnerships with local businesses and our students participate in the JA in a Day program annually. We also partner with Read 2 Succeed to provide additional reading support for struggling readers in first and second grade.

Teachers and support staff will participate in the OCPS Social-Emotional Learning and Leadership professional development sessions and work collaboratively to implement the strategies throughout our school.

Pinar Elementary ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing the following services and instructional resources to support student needs:

- Social-Emotional Learning competencies
- Threat Assessment Team
- Counseling referrals as needed
- Social Skills instruction

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: ELA				\$1,414,030.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1541 - Pinar Elementary	General Fund		\$1,328,391.00
			<i>Notes: Teachers will work to increase reading achievement levels and learning gains.</i>			
	5100	160-Other Support Personnel	1541 - Pinar Elementary	Ttitle III		\$34,716.00
			<i>Notes: Bilingual paraprofessionals to support ELL students.</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1541 - Pinar Elementary	General Fund		\$30,692.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach to support teachers with ELA instruction and intervention.</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1541 - Pinar Elementary	Other Federal		\$10,231.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach to support teachers with ELA instruction and intervention.</i>			
	5900	100-Salaries	1541 - Pinar Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Tutors to support students in ELA and writing.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$1,484,000.00

Orange - 1541 - Pinar Elementary - 2020-21 SIP

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	1541 - Pinar Elementary	General Fund		\$1,328,391.00
			<i>Notes: Teachers will work to increase math achievement levels, fluency, and learning gains.</i>			
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1541 - Pinar Elementary			\$74,892.00
			<i>Notes: Resource teacher to support teachers and students in math.</i>			
	5900	100-Salaries	1541 - Pinar Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Tutors to support students in math.</i>			
	5200	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1541 - Pinar Elementary	IDEA		\$70,717.00
			<i>Notes: SLD teacher to provide support facilitation instruction for students.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
					Total:	\$2,898,030.00