Pine Forest Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pine Forest Elementary School

3929 GRANT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/pineforest

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Matthews   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (60%) 2014-15: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Pine Forest Elementary School

3929 GRANT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/pineforest

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	58%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

As a success-oriented school, Pine Forest drives academic achievement and nurtures artistic self-expression within a cooperative learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pine Forest School of the Arts: "Where the Arts and Academics Meet Center Stage"

Who We Are:
Pine Forest School of the Arts is a dedicated Magnet elementary school committed to excellence in both standards-based academics and the arts.

What We Do:
We provide a Visual and Performing Arts program that helps promising students cultivate their passion and strengthen their talent for arts activities while ensuring academic excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Matthews, Michelle	Principal	Instructional Leader Operations Manager Weekly Communication to All Stakeholders
Momberg, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade ELA Teacher Reading Committee Chair Former School-Based Reading Coach

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	68	72	71	67	83	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
436

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	69%	50%	57%	67%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	56%	58%	69%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	58%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	62%	63%	66%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	63%	62%	53%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	51%	26%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	48%	53%	67%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	68 (0)	72 (0)	71 (0)	67 (0)	83 (0)	75 (0)	436 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	14 (0)	12 (0)	28 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	51%	17%	58%	10%
	2018	66%	50%	16%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
	2018	76%	49%	27%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	71%	50%	21%	56%	15%
	2018	68%	51%	17%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	61%	5%	62%	4%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	64%	2%	64%	2%
	2018	70%	60%	10%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	58%	57%	1%	60%	-2%
	2018	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	49%	9%	53%	5%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	35	25	24	34	38	23				
BLK	55	60	55	47	52	40	52				
HSP	77	75		69	55						
WHT	81	74	36	76	68	30	69				
FRL	54	60	50	53	56	38	42				
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	54	59	47	39	55	47	33				
BLK	55	63	58	48	58	44	33				
HSP	81	67		73	67						

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
MUL	90			90							
WHT	81	70		74	69		88				
FRL	57	58	54	55	64	47	47				
2017 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	44	74	79	34	13						
BLK	46	59	57	49	42	21	42				
HSP	78	67		67	42						
WHT	82	77	73	81	65		85				
FRL	49	59	52	51	32	16	47				

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	58
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	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Math Lowest Performing Quartile was the lowest performing area for 2018-2019.
Contributors for last year's low performance/trends:
*Time Management-not enough time to provide differentiated small-group instruction (centers)
*Too much emphasis and confidence in Blended Learning programs compared to Teacher-Led instruction during small-group/center time
*Daily Exposure to Standards-Based Instruction for all students and daily practice to problems, questions, etc. aligned to standard, test specifications, etc.

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

Math Lowest Performing Quartile was the lowest performing area for 2018-2019.
Contributors for last year's low performance/trends:
*Time Management-not enough time to provide differentiated small-group instruction (centers)
*Too much emphasis and confidence in Blended Learning programs compared to Teacher-Led instruction during small-group/center time
*Daily Exposure to Standards-Based Instruction for all students and daily practice to problems, questions, etc. aligned to standard, test specifications, etc.

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.

Math showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average.
Factors/Trends Contributing to this Gap:
*Time Management During Instructional Time (not enough time for small-group instruction compared to whole-group core instruction
*Lack of Math Fluency
*Lack of Math Vocabulary

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

5th Grade Reading showed the most improvement
Actions Taken to See Increase: Frequent Data Chats with students, daily monitoring of data, Standards-Mastery assessments, novel studies.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

*Data Chats and Student Monitoring of Data and Performance
*Student Tasks/Assignments aligned to standards and require students to complete tasks at the same rigor that they will see on assessments.

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

1. Math Gains
2. Reading Gains
3. Science Proficiency
4. Math Proficiency
5. Reading Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Daily Standards-Based Instruction in K-5 ELA, Math, and Science Classrooms
Rationale	In order to ensure that students are meeting grade-level expectations in Reading, Math, Science, and other academic and arts areas, it is important that teachers provide standard-based instruction to all students on a daily basis during their whole-group instructional block time.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	2018-2019: Reading Proficiency: 69% 2019-2020 Reading Proficiency Goal: 70% Reading LPQ Gains: 50% Reading Gains: 55% Math Proficiency: 63% Math Proficiency: 65% Math LPQ Gains: 38% Math Gains: 45% Science Proficiency: 58% Science: 60%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	*DCPS created Standards Walk-Through Tool *Classroom Walk-Throughs and Observations *Admin-Led Common Planning Session *Unpacking Standard Protocol and Lesson Planning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through the use of the Standard-Based Walk-Through Tool during classroom visits, data will be analyzed and used to drive Admin-Led Common Planning sessions. In addition, teachers will be supported with unpacking content-area standards and with lesson planning as needed to ensure that all students are being provided the opportunity to practice problems, answer questions, read text, etc. in the same manner in which they will be assessed on the Florida Standards Assessment.

Action Step	
Description	1. Minimum of 10 Classroom Visits Using the Standard Walk-Through (SWT) Tool each week by each administrator with feedback to teachers 2. Review of data collected through the SWT Tool and use to provide differentiated Admin-Led Common Planning Sessions each week. 3. Lesson Planning/Curriculum/Standards Support provided by Administration and District Specialists 4. Data Chats with Administration 5. Review Lesson Plans 6. Review Student Work Samples
Person Responsible	Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Reading Gains and Lowest Performing Quartile Gains
Rationale	Through observations, there is too much time spent on whole-group instruction compared to differentiated small-group instruction. Blended Learning Programs such as iReady and Achieve 3000 should not be the only differentiated learning opportunities students receive throughout the school day. Meeting with small groups of students in a Teacher-Led group setting is vital.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	2019-2020 Reading LPQ Goal: 55% Reading Gains Goal: 65%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Admin-Led Common Planning and Data Chats with both students and teachers including individual goal-setting and frequent student monitoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Reviewing student data frequently not only shows the students that you are continuously monitoring their performance, it also helps the teacher to make shifts in his/her instruction when planning for future lessons.

Action Step	
Description	1. Admin/Teacher Data Chats and Review of Student Work Samples 2. Data Chats with Students (by Teachers and Administrators) 3. Support in a Small-Group Setting (differentiated instruction) by teacher or other faculty/staff member (i.e. administrator, tutor, other teacher, paraprofessional...)
Person Responsible	Michelle Matthews (easterm@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).