
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Pinewood Elementary School

3757 OLD DIXIE HWY, Mims, FL 32754

<http://www.pinewood.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Mitzi Robinson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	69%
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 Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Brevard 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

Pinewood Elementary School is a community partnership committed to fostering a positive educational experience by developing all students to their fullest potential. (revised 8/19)

Provide the school's vision statement

The Pinewood community is committed to pursuing academic excellence in a supportive, caring, and challenging environment.

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
Robinson, Mitzi	Principal	The Principal is the instructional leader and leads the team through all aspects of school improvement, data analysis and collaborative decision making. She leads the Pinewood Leadership Team, which meets every Monday morning to discuss upcoming school events, PBIS, data, and MTSS. The team coordinates individual team member calendars, including MTSS/ IPST meeting dates and times. Upcoming data team meeting agendas are also created during these meetings. These meetings are also used to problem solve issues that arise within the school. The results of the meetings are then shared with appropriate parties.
Nelson, Melanie	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports all aspects of school improvement. She will attend all leadership team meetings and will oversee the teacher assigned as the MTSS coordinator. Ms. Nelson is also our Testing Coordinator.
Lang, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Lang is our MTSS coordinator and co-Title I coordinator. She will lead the work of the MTSS development, supports data collection and specialized subgroup populations development, including the lowest quartile students. She provides student intervention.
Russell, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Russell is co-Title I Coordinator and she provides student interventions and data collections. She oversees the Title 1 Framework and mentors the new teachers.
Vaughan, Kathleen	Instructional Coach	Ms. Vaughan is the Literacy Coach. She leads the literacy programming and ongoing iReady Data Analysis.
Nason, Jennifer	Guidance Counselor	Mrs. Nason is our guidance counselor. She monitors our students with 504's and supports our IPST meetings and maintains the meeting calendar.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/1/2016, Mitzi Robinson

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.*

3

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

39

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	69%
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 Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	74	51	59	59	64	67	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	3	1	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	1	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	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	1	1	1	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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

Wednesday 9/2/2020

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	70	72	63	72	67	58	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	13	30	19	10	22	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	4	1	1	3	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	22	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	12	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	31	19	8	19	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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	13	10	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	70	72	63	72	67	58	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	13	30	19	10	22	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	4	1	1	3	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	22	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	12	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	31	19	8	19	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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	13	10	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	67%	62%	57%	56%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	60%	58%	47%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	57%	53%	43%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	67%	63%	63%	62%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	65%	65%	62%	55%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	53%	51%	45%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	76%	57%	53%	67%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(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	69%	64%	5%	58%	11%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	61%	3%	58%	6%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	68%	60%	8%	56%	12%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2019	63%	60%	3%	54%	9%
	2018	46%	63%	-17%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	61%	1%	62%	0%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	73%	64%	9%	64%	9%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	70%	60%	10%	60%	10%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	62%	67%	-5%	55%	7%
	2018	58%	68%	-10%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	56%	18%	53%	21%
	2018	66%	57%	9%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	24	47	44	41	65	54					
BLK	25	60		25	50						
MUL	73	83		58	67						
WHT	68	68	51	71	65	56	82				
FRL	61	69	61	60	61	52	70				

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	16	29	30	29	46	43	20				
BLK	8	50		15	64						
MUL	54	37		54	47						
WHT	57	47	38	67	55	41	74				
FRL	47	44	48	51	52	44	64				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	66
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	62
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

ELA lowest 25% is the biggest concern.

56% of our lowest 25% scored proficient on the FSA. Proficiency has been below 56% for the past 4 years.

School wide iReady data shows an increase in Tier I from 17% (diagnostic 1) to 31% (diagnostic 2)

a decrease in Tier 2 71% to 62%, and a Tier 3 decrease from 12% to 8%

For the 19/20 school year we used the iReady FSA prediction cut scores to figure out each student's predicted FSA score after taking the second diagnostic. School-wide iReady predicted that only 50% of our students would have scored proficient on the FSA

if they had taken it that same day. With several months of instruction left in the school year before FSA we were pushing to raise this percentage in order to meet our goal for last year. We were making progress, but feel that COVID may have stalled the learning of many of our students and therefore are choosing to focus again this year on the lowest 25% and writing across the curriculum. We had one subgroup, African American students, fall below the Federal Index. There are currently 17 students in this subgroup, six K, one 1st, two 2nd, one 3rd, two 4th, two 5th, two 6th. Of the students currently in this subgroup 3 students were Pinewood students when they took the FSA in 18/19. Two of the three students fell in our lowest 25%. We will closely monitor this subgroup in data meetings.

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

We did not have a decline on FSA data.

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

We were above the state in all areas.
We were the highest performing school with iReady pass rates during distance learning.

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

ELA learning gains increased by 21% from 47% in 2018 to 68% in 2019. In the 19/20 school year Pinewood instituted by-weekly data team meetings to review and track student data. We implemented i-Ready with fidelity and also tracked usage, minutes, and passing rate. We also had quarterly vertical team meetings to discuss strengths and weaknesses of students across grade level. Monthly incentives paired with student goal setting allowed students to monitor their own i-Ready progress and adjust accordingly. More teacher intervention and student recognition during i-Ready lessons provided better results. Individual student recognition is done monthly by leadership team.

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

Number of students with one or more suspensions.

The data shows we have 15 retained kindergarten students, however 11 of these students are TK1 students, not true kindergarten retentions. We felt these students just needed another year of social/emotional development before first grade.

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

1. Writing across the curriculum to support the lowest 25% on ELA.
2. Focus on social emotional/relationship building utilizing PBIS rewards to increase student positive behaviors and decrease suspensions.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Pinewood Elementary learning gains for the lowest 25% have been stagnate over the last several years. We believe the problem is occurring because of a lack of teacher focus on writing especially in content areas other than ELA. In 2020-21 we will focus on identifying and supporting the lowest 25% students in K-6 through targeted interventions for reading.

Measureable Outcome: Increase the learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA. Goal is to increase ELA lowest 25% learning gains from 56% to 65%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: School wide writing across the content areas and text based writing with complex text in ELA focusing on writing in response to text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We feel a focus on school wide writing across the content areas and text based writing with complex text in ELA will increase student learning gains through an increase use of writing as a means of deepening content and literary knowledge and teaching students how to support their answers with text based evidence. Data driven writing instruction will also help to inform teachers which students need additional support in this area.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Bi-weekly grade level data meetings. In the 20/21 school year one meeting each month will be solely dedicated to discussing the lowest 25% and our African American subgroup and what strategies can be put in place for learning gains. The other monthly meeting will be to discuss progress of all students to ensure none fall through the cracks.

Person Responsible Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

2. MTSS facilitator will monitor lowest 25% students after each iReady diagnostic. (T)

Person Responsible Michelle Lang (lang.michelle@brevardschools.org)

3. Use i-Ready with fidelity by monitoring minutes and pass rates for prescriptive pathways and deficits monthly.

Person Responsible Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

4. Monthly i-Ready classroom and/or student recognition by leadership team.

Person Responsible Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

5. Title I teachers and instructional assistants will provide intervention and classroom support for students in the lowest 25%. (T)

Person Responsible Michelle Lang (lang.michelle@brevardschools.org)

6. Strengthening Tier 1 instruction with all classroom teachers through the use of the updated standards focus documents and the new standards aligned questioning document. Support, guidance, and modeling by our reading coach. (T)

Person Responsible Kathleen Vaughan (vaughan.kathleen@brevardschools.org)

7. Ongoing support from the Literacy Coach through Reading Endorsement trainings focusing on writing across the curriculum.

Person Responsible Kathleen Vaughan (vaughan.kathleen@brevardschools.org)

8. ELA will be monitored by i-Ready diagnostic three times a year and the lowest 25% will be growth monitored.

Person Responsible Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

9. Continue to administer QLAs each quarter to monitor writing growth. We will use performance matters to pull data to discuss in data team meetings after each QLA.

Person Responsible Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

10. Provide substitutes to send teachers to observe other exemplary teachers. (T)

Person Responsible Jamie Russell (russell.jamieleigh@brevardschools.org)

11. Purchased i-Ready workbooks for grades 3, 4, 5, 6. (T)

Person Responsible Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

12. Purchased computers to support student iReady instruction. (T)

Person Responsible Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

13. ASP/CARES funding will be used to hire a teacher during the school day to support 3rd and 4th grade to close academic gaps.

Person Responsible Mitzi Robinson (robinson.mitzi@brevardschools.org)

14. We will create an iReady reporting group to monitor our ESSA subgroup, African American students. We will track their progress on diagnostics, lessons, and standards mastery. Our reading coach will work with teachers to increase student success and provide intervention guidance as needed. The data will also be discussed/reviewed at grade level data team meetings.

Person Responsible Kathleen Vaughan (vaughan.kathleen@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

To address the number of students with one or more suspensions during the school year teachers will reward PAW bucks for positive behavior and focus on students' social emotional needs/relationship building. The leadership team will track teacher input at biweekly data team meeting and provide monthly PBIS rewards to students. Title I teachers and Instructional assistants will be used to support the PBIS program. (T)

We recognize the importance of the district strategic plan and we realize that to prepare for our kindergarten students they need support in all areas of development. We hold kindergarten round up, we support a strong VPK, and we utilize a Title I IA to support kindergarten. We also focus on our third grade literacy by concentrating on the foundations of learning to read, we utilize Title I support for our students who have learning gaps. We ensure that all student work with complex grade level curriculum daily and apply the content to real world problems.

******CONTINUED FROM POSITIVE CULTURE SECTION DUE TO WORD LIMIT IN THAT SECTION*******

The Youth Truth survey showed that only 48% of our students felt that the work they did in class made them really think. We feel that having students justify their thinking and supporting it with evidence through writing across the curriculum would positively increase this percentage. The data also shows that only 13% felt that students behave well “very often.” Putting a more prominent focus on PBIS this year will help to increase positive student behavior. In the BPS Parent survey parents asked that staff “provide more feedback about what they are seeing in the classroom. Enforcing behavioral policies so students are less distracted.” This data is additional evidence for the need to strengthen our PBIS program.

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.

BPS Parent Survey data reveals that 82% of parents feel they received information on how to help their child at home. Pinewood hosts several family involvement events throughout the

school year including grade level specific curriculum nights, Bedtime Story Night, and Pinewood Page Turners in order to reach most parents. We see there may be gaps and parents we don't reach, so Pinewood communicates regularly with families and community stakeholders through Facebook posts, flyers, and a monthly newsletter. A school calendar and informational handbook are also sent home with every student. Pinewood offers a multitude of materials that parents can check out to work with their child at home. We have resources for every grade level and subject and offer to train parents in using them. The Parent Survey also reveals that 92% of parents feel welcome at Pinewood and numerous parents wrote positive comments about Pinewood's teachers and that Pinewood is a friendly place. Pinewood builds relationships with the community through a number of activities and events including registration day, Feeder Chain Homecoming Parade, community parades, and having business partners volunteer time and resources that improve student achievement. A local church and Second Harvest provide students meals to take home on the weekend. A Science Fair night, Art Fair, and Music Programs provide families an opportunity to observe their child's learning. A Flagpole ceremony is held monthly and includes a grade level musical performance and Student of the Month awards for each class. The School Advisory Council provides parents and community members a voice in school decision making. We request feedback on decisions through newsletters and online surveys, and offer exit slips at the end of all parent involvement nights requesting opinions of families. According to the Teacher Insight Survey 100% of Pinewood teachers felt that interactions between students and adults at school are respectful, 100% feel Pinewood is a good place to teach and learn, 100% feel school leaders promote a safe and productive learning environment, 100% feel students can achieve the academic standards for their grade level. In order to create this environment, Pinewood utilizes PBIS. PBIS involves not just students and faculty but also community. Teachers provide classroom PBIS incentives as well as the PBIS team organizing a variety of school wide rewards including a quarterly PAW Store, lunch rewards, and special events. Community partners and parent volunteers support these events. According to the Youth Truth Student Survey 82% of students felt their teacher treated them with respect, 86% think their teacher cares about them, 75% feel like they learn a lot in class, 97% feel their teacher wants them to do their best. This is a reflection of PBIS, Sanford Harmony (social emotional program), and guidance counselor groups.

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	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00