



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Pine Forest High School

2500 LONGLEAF DR

Pensacola, FL 32526

850-941-6150

www.escambia.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type
High School

Title I
Yes

Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
69%

Alternative/ESE Center
No

Charter School
No

Minority Rate
62%

School Grades History

2013-14
C

2012-13
C

2011-12
C

2010-11
C

SIP Authority and Template

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

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| Differentiated Accountability | 5 |
| Part I: Current School Status | 6 |
| Part II: Expected Improvements | 16 |
| Goals Summary | 21 |
| Goals Detail | 21 |
| Action Plan for Improvement | 23 |
| Part III: Coordination and Integration | 25 |
| Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals | 26 |
| Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
 - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
 - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
 - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
 - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
 - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

| DA Category | Region | RED |
|-------------|--------|-----|
| Not in DA | N/A | N/A |

| Former F | Post-Priority Planning | Planning | Implementing TOP |
|----------|------------------------|----------|------------------|
| No | No | No | No |

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Pine Forest High School

Principal

Frank Murphy

School Advisory Council chair

Michelle Lewis

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

| Name | Title |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Frank Murphy | Principal |
| Deborah Ray | Assistant Principal |
| Jeff Elliott | Assistant Principal |
| Scott Whedon | English/Language Arts |
| Kathy Jenkins | Science |
| Don Johnson | Social Studies |
| Deborah Young | Fine Arts |
| Kathy Gilliland | CTE |
| Captain Judy Miller | NJROTC |
| Chris Godwin | Physical Education |
| Eileen Doss | Mathematics |
| Ranee Cunningham | Exceptional Student Education |
| Anne McGowan | Literacy Coach |
| Susan Rigby | Mathematics Coach |
| David Rigby | Administrative Dean |
| Michael Samala | Guidance |
| Jane Phillips | Family and Consumer Science |

District-Level Information

District

Escambia

Superintendent

Mr. Malcolm Thomas

Date of school board approval of SIP

10/15/2013

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

Barbara Goram - ESP
Michelle Lewis - ESP - Chair
Jeff Elliott - Assistant Principal
Deborah Ray - Assistant Principal
Frank Murphy - Principal
Michael Samala - Guidance Director
Ellen Crow - Media Specialist/Union Representative
Sandra Gross - Instructional Aide
Jeff Lamont - Math Teacher
Aisha Adkison - District Representative
Adrienne Taylor - Community Representative
Sean Barnes - Parent
Kim Braddock - Parent
Theresa Crews - Parent
Jacqueline Brazile - Student
Diamond Brundidge - Student
Savannah Wright - Student
Alyssa Gonzales - Student
Marissa Moreno - Student
Katherine - Student
John Cu - Student
DeMarion Miller - Student
Kristofer Kidd - Student
Amanda Jackson - Student
Jammie Yeldon - Student

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The SAC was directly involved with the development of the SIP in the decisions about building the school vision, creating of Parental Involvement activities, and the remediation needs of the school population.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The SAC will be involved in the beautification project of the school, additional maintenance and/or building projects, the success of our newly-implemented double-blocked courses, and additional Parental Involvement activities for this school year.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

SIP funds utilized this year will focus primarily on materials required for enhanced student engagement. Such items are as follows:
smart boards, classroom sets of calculators, projectors, document cameras, laptop carts, individual white boards, and iPads for instructional staff members.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators

3

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Frank Murphy

Principal

Years as Administrator: 12

Years at Current School: 6

Credentials

BS - Elementary Education, Livingston University, Livingston, Alabama

MS - Educational Leadership, University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida

Principal Certification - State of Florida

Performance Record

2012-2013 AYP: No; Reading 32%; 56%; School Grade: Not Determined

2011-2012 AYP: Yes; Reading 63%; Math 71%

2011-2012 Principal at Pine Forest High School; School Grade: C

2010-2011 Principal at Pine Forest High School; School Grade: C

2010-2011 AYP: Reading 36%; Math 67%

2009-2010 Principal at Pine Forest High School; School Grade: D

2009-2010 AYP: 74%

2008-2009 Principal at Pine Forest High School; School Grade : C

2008-2009 AYP: 72%

2007-2008 Assistant Principal at Escambia high School; School Grade: D

2007-2008 AYP: 82%

2006-2007 Assistant Principal at Escambia High School; School Grade: C

2006-2007 AYP: 82%

Jeff Elliott

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 6

Years at Current School: 2

Credentials

BS - Technology Management, Clayton State College, Atlanta Georgia
 MS - Instructional Technology, University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida
 Specialist - Educational Leadership, University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida

Performance Record

2012-2013 AYP: No; Reading 32%; 56%; School Grade: Not Determined
 2011-2012 AYP: Yes; Reading 63%; Math 71%
 2011-2012 Assistant Principal at Pine Forest High School; School Grade: C

Deborah Ray

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 3

Years at Current School: 1

Credentials

MS - Education and Human Development in the field of Educational Leadership and Administration, University of George Washington, Washington, D.C.
 Special Education Certification - University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas
 BS - Communication Sciences and Disorders, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas

Performance Record

2012-2013 AYP: No; Reading 32%; 56%; School Grade: Not Determined
 2011-2012 Assistant Principal at Northview High School: Grade C
 2010-2011 Assistant Principal at Northview High School: Grade B
 2010-2011 AYP: 90%

Instructional Coaches**# of instructional coaches**

2

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

| Anne McGowan | | |
|---------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Full-time / School-based | Years as Coach: 1 | Years at Current School: 5 |
| Areas | Reading/Literacy | |
| Credentials | BS - Elementary Education Certified in English 6-12 and Integrated Curriculum 5-9 Reading Endorsed ESOL Endorsed | |
| Performance Record | 2012-2013 AYP: No; Reading 32%; 56%; School Grade: Not Determined | |

| Susan Rigby | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Full-time / School-based | Years as Coach: 0 | Years at Current School: 11 |
| Areas | Mathematics, RtI/MTSS | |
| Credentials | Master's Degree in Special Education from University of West Florida Bachelor's Degree in Business Management from University of West Florida ESE Certification - All Grades Middle School Mathematics | |
| Performance Record | This is Susan Rigby's first year as the Mathematics Coach. | |

Classroom Teachers

| | |
|---|----------|
| # of classroom teachers | 110 |
| # receiving effective rating or higher | 0% |
| # Highly Qualified Teachers | 59% |
| # certified in-field | 103, 94% |
| # ESOL endorsed | 8, 7% |
| # reading endorsed | 15, 14% |
| # with advanced degrees | 42, 38% |
| # National Board Certified | 7, 6% |

first-year teachers

3, 3%

with 1-5 years of experience

26, 24%

with 6-14 years of experience

31, 28%

with 15 or more years of experience

35, 32%

Education Paraprofessionals**# of paraprofessionals**

8

Highly Qualified

8, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel**# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

7

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

S.T.A.R.T. Program will provide mentoring, professional development, and resources to first year teachers. Selected District staff will assist new teachers in this process. Efforts are made by each administrator to work closely with the District's HR personnel to screen eligible applicants, hire, and secure Highly Qualified instructional staff members.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Teachers who are new to Pine Forest High School will be paired with a veteran teacher. The veteran teacher will be tasked with working with new member on curriculum planning, the E3 Evaluation Process, and acclimating them to the school's expectations and procedures.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

The Pine Forest High School Response to Instruction/Intervention team work both separately and together to provide guidance, support, and resources to teachers, students, and parents within the Pine Forest High School learning community.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

They meet quarterly to review school-wide data, both academic and behavioral data, to determine school and student needs. After reviewing the data they will make recommendations to the appropriate stakeholder so that improvements can be obtained. The Rtl team works in the forefront to assist in closing the gap between universal instruction and small group instruction. They work with teachers to assist with best practices so that students are receiving the highest level of instruction possible.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

The Rtl team works collaboratively with other teams within the Pine Forest learning community. The School Leadership Team, SREB Leadership Team, Reading Literacy Team, and the Behavior Management Team all benefit from the Rtl team's interaction.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Reading: FCAT, FAIR, Maze, and Fluency

Math: Algebra EOC, Geometry EOC, District SAEs, Semester Exams, School Net

Science: Pre and Post Biology Test, District SAEs, Q1, and Q2, School Net

Writing: School prompts, Escambia Writes, FCAT Writes

Behavior: Local data source, TERMS, and FOCUS

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

With the data received through our School Wide Behavior Management Team, quarterly progress reports and grades, as well as special recommendations provided by our instructional staff, we will work diligently to provide adequate services for qualifying students. Students involved in Child Study will receive academic support in the core content areas, a recommendation for psychological testing if necessary, and a plan geared towards meeting their individual learning needs.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program**Minutes added to school year:** 0

- Professional Development Training is offered to teachers in the pre-school planning period twice monthly.
- Tutorials are offered to students in the area of mathematics twice weekly.
- Saturday ACT/SAT preparatory courses are offered to participating students on the Saturday prior to the assessment.
- Learning Communities have been established in the following areas:
 Behavior - Positive Behavior Support Teams
 Mathematics - Math Design Collaborative
 English/Language Arts - Literacy Design Collaborative
 Collaborative Teaching - Co-Teaching Support with Florida Inclusion Network

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Data is collected on a quarterly basis to determine if the progress of students in the core content areas, behavior, attendance, as well as college readiness.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Administrative Staff is responsible for monitoring implementation of the established academic and behavioral support programs.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT**

| Name | Title |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| Anne McGowan | Literacy Coach |
| Frank Murphy | Principal |
| Deborah Ray | Assistant Principal |
| Jeff Elliott | Assistant Principal |
| Stephanie Elliott | Biology Teacher |
| Judy Davis | CTE Teacher |
| Angela Irby | CTE Teacher |
| Jessica Gordon | Social Studies Teacher |
| Kelly Young | English/Language Arts Teacher |
| Linda Willis | English/Language Arts Teacher |
| Richard Loiselle | Social Studies Teacher |

| Name | Title |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Lyle Messer | Social Studies Teacher |
| Sean Roby | Biology Teacher |
| Linda Ables | Biology Teacher |
| Coleen Forsman | Exceptional Education Teacher |

How the school-based LLT functions

The Literacy Leadership Team will work closely with the SREB to implement strategies from the Literacy Design Collaborative Model. Strategies are designed to meet the rigor embedded in the Common Core State Standards and will satisfy the College/Career Readiness Goals.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The major initiatives is to implement literacy strategies across the curriculum and to adequately prepare students for the rigor of the anticipated Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers (PARCC) Assessment. The school-wide implementation of LDC strategies requires teachers to incorporate writing in every unit taught, as well as supplement their curriculum with additional primary sources. Primary sources and/or informational texts will provide the relevance of the instructional material and allow students to respond to an essential question, with supportive evidence, at the completion of the assigned tasks.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Professional Development Training is provided to every instructional staff member. Our Literacy Coach works with individual departments on strategies such as Close Reading, enhancing student engagement, Informational Texts, providing textual evidence to support responses, and implementing the IVF Model (Identify, Verb, Finish the Thought). Collaboration between Reading, English/Language Arts and History has been mandated to provide consistency across the curriculum in which have embedded end of course assessments.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

The design of the elective courses is in the capacity of a Career Academy. Students explore a career track in the area that meets the criteria for the pursuit of their post-graduation endeavors.

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

The counselors assigned to the specific grade level meet with individual students to go over the academic history, credits earned, and end of course assessments to determine the requirements needed to progress to the next academic year with peers in their particular co-hort. The course of study is considered, standard diploma requirements, and whether or not the student desires to seek a particular diploma designation.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

Pine Forest High School is working in an educational partnership with the Southern Regional Education Board to implement rigorous strategies through their Math Design Collaborative and the Literacy Design Collaborative Models. Strategies are designed to infuse literacy across the curriculum, allow for effective reasoning through student productive struggle, and to provide formative assessment lessons for teachers.

Students in each grade level will participate in a mentorship program provided in their homeroom classes. Business partners will be assigned to the courses and work collaboratively with instructional staff members to develop a curriculum on financial literacy, workplace behaviors and expectations, resume writing, and enhancing interviewing skills.

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

| Group | 2013 Target % | 2013 Actual % | Target Met? | 2014 Target % |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| All Students | 48% | 32% | No | 53% |
| American Indian | 79% | 25% | No | 81% |
| Asian | 79% | 32% | No | 81% |
| Black/African American | 33% | 24% | No | 40% |
| Hispanic | 53% | 31% | No | 58% |
| White | 58% | 42% | No | 62% |
| English language learners | | | | |
| Students with disabilities | 28% | 17% | No | 36% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 42% | 27% | No | 48% |

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 163 | 19% | 24% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 104 | 12% | 17% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | 10 | 76% | 78% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 25% |

Learning Gains

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA) | 468 | 53% | 54% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0) | 510 | 61% | 65% |

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | 11 | 41% | 45% |
| Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 20% |
| Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 35% |

Postsecondary Readiness

| | 2012 Actual # | 2012 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C. | 50 | 34% | 37% |

Area 2: Writing

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5 | 209 | 55% | 65% |
| Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4 | 10 | 90% | 92% |

Area 3: Mathematics**High School Mathematics****Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

| Group | 2013 Target % | 2013 Actual % | Target Met? | 2014 Target % |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| All Students | 48% | 56% | Yes | 54% |
| American Indian | | | | |
| Asian | 67% | 53% | No | 70% |
| Black/African American | 40% | 47% | Yes | 46% |
| Hispanic | 44% | 52% | Yes | 50% |
| White | 54% | 64% | Yes | 59% |
| English language learners | | | | |
| Students with disabilities | 31% | 31% | Yes | 38% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 47% | 51% | Yes | 52% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | 10 | 92% | 93% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 25% |

Learning Gains

| | 2012 Actual # | 2012 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA) | 378 | 62% | 65% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC) | 262 | 43% | 65% |

Postsecondary Readiness

| | 2012 Actual # | 2012 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C. | 86 | 6% | 8% |

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 138 | 43% | 65% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 29 | 9% | 20% |

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 102 | 35% | 40% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 55 | 19% | 25% |

Area 4: Science**High School Science****Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 78% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 15% |

Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 125 | 40% | 50% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 22 | 7% | 15% |

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)**All Levels**

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target |
|--|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| # of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs) | 1712 | | 100 |
| Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students | 1712 | 100% | 100% |

High Schools

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses | 1196 | 72% | 75% |
| Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses | | 9% | 12% |
| Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses | | | |
| CTE-STEM program concentrators | 33 | | 2 |
| Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams | 427 | 35% | 38% |
| Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams | | 78% | 80% |

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses | 1196 | 72% | 75% |
| Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses | 113 | 9% | 12% |
| Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses | | | |
| Students taking CTE industry certification exams | 427 | 35% | 40% |
| Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams | | 78% | 81% |
| CTE program concentrators | 33 | 2% | 4% |
| CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications | 3 | 50% | 100% |

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

High School Indicators

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time | 447 | 25% | 15% |
| Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days | 25 | 1% | 1% |
| Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject | 105 | 23% | 13% |
| Students with grade point average less than 2.0 | 472 | 27% | 17% |
| Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade | 105 | 23% | 13% |
| Students who receive two or more behavior referrals | 617 | 36% | 26% |
| Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S. | 344 | 20% | 14% |

Graduation

| | 2012 Actual # | 2012 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S. | 4 | 1% | 1% |
| Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) | 153 | 55% | 60% |
| Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C. | 98 | 35% | 45% |
| Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) | 145 | 52% | 55% |

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

Parental involvement target at our school is to provide more opportunities for parents to engage in activities that are directly related to enhancing literacy strategies, increasing the rigor across the curriculum, increasing college and career readiness activities, and increasing opportunities to provide information on co-hort/student progression, and graduation requirements.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

| Target | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Increased participation in parental involvement activities | 800 | 30% | 40% |

Goals Summary

G1. Increase student engagement.

Goals Detail

G1. Increase student engagement.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Math (High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Science
- Science - High School
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- STEM
- STEM - High School
- CTE
- EWS - High School

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Literacy Coach, Southern Regional Education Bureau, Literacy Design Collaborative, School Community Business Partners, Title I Funds

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Poor attendance, teachers not receptive to student engagement strategies/structures, poor writing abilities of students, lack of monetary resources, decrease number of parents who are able to participate in Parental Involvement activities.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Informal and formal assessments, teacher attendance in training activities, student performance in content areas, parent attendance, student attendance percentage

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Staff, Literacy and Math Coaches, District Personnel, and Professional Learning Department

Target Dates or Schedule:

Quarterly

Evidence of Completion:

Results of formal and informal assessments, documentation of student attendance (FTE), documentation of parent attendance, documentation of teacher attendance (professional development)

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Increase student engagement.

G1.B1 Poor attendance, teachers not receptive to student engagement strategies/structures, poor writing abilities of students, lack of monetary resources, decrease number of parents who are able to participate in Parental Involvement activities.

G1.B1.S1 Professional Development activities are provided twice a month to provide strategies for instructional staff members to enhance student engagement in the classroom environment. We are reaching out to neighboring businesses to develop new school community partnerships. We are also increasing the number of parental involvement activities, as well as offering activities at different times of the day to accommodate the busy schedules of our parents.

Action Step 1

Provide numerous resources and training opportunities for our instructional staff members.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators, District Instructional Specialists, School Community Partnerships

Target Dates or Schedule

Throughout the 2013-2014 School Year

Evidence of Completion

Attendance Documentation for Instructional Staff, Passing percentage on formal assessments/classroom pass rate, Attendance Documentation for Parental Involvement Activities.

Facilitator:

Administrative Staff, District Instructional Specialists, School Community Partners (SREB, Florida Inclusion Network)

Participants:

Pine Forest High School Instructional Staff / Educational Support Personnel

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

Data Collection for individual instructional staff members i.e. informal and formal assessments, FAIR, FCAT, District Subject Area Exams, School-wide Behavior Management Team Disciplinary Reports, Parental Involvement Documentation of Attendance and Parent Satisfaction Surveys

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Team - Principal, Assistant Principal of Student Services, Assistant Principal of Operations

Target Dates or Schedule

Quarterly Reports

Evidence of Completion

End of the Year Review and Escambia Education Evaluation (E3) Reports

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Quarterly assessments, formal assessments, quarterly disciplinary reports, and input from school community in survey format.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Staff - Principal, Assistant Principal of Student Services, Assistant Principal of Operations, Academic Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Quarterly

Evidence of Completion

End of the Year Academic Reports/Assessments and Educator Evaluation System

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title I Funds - Monies allocated for Title I will be allocated in these concentrated areas:

Instructional - Literacy Coach, Mathematics Coach, .5 Gifted

Parental Involvement

Professional Development

Instructional Materials/Academic Programs

All funds will have adequate documentation and data that will provide an in-depth explanation as to the activity, how programs were academically enriched, as well as student growth data.

SAI Funds will be allocated in these concentrated areas:

Professional Development

Instructional Materials

School Community Involvement

CTE:

Computer Software and Hardware

Instructional Staff

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Increase student engagement.

G1.B1 Poor attendance, teachers not receptive to student engagement strategies/structures, poor writing abilities of students, lack of monetary resources, decrease number of parents who are able to participate in Parental Involvement activities.

G1.B1.S1 Professional Development activities are provided twice a month to provide strategies for instructional staff members to enhance student engagement in the classroom environment. We are reaching out to neighboring businesses to develop new school community partnerships. We are also increasing the number of parental involvement activities, as well as offering activities at different times of the day to accommodate the busy schedules of our parents.

PD Opportunity 1

Provide numerous resources and training opportunities for our instructional staff members.

Facilitator

Administrative Staff, District Instructional Specialists, School Community Partners (SREB, Florida Inclusion Network)

Participants

Pine Forest High School Instructional Staff / Educational Support Personnel

Target Dates or Schedule

Throughout the 2013-2014 School Year

Evidence of Completion

Attendance Documentation for Instructional Staff, Passing percentage on formal assessments/ classroom pass rate, Attendance Documentation for Parental Involvement Activities.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

| Goal | Description | Total |
|------|------------------------------|-----------|
| G1. | Increase student engagement. | \$117,658 |
| | Total | \$117,658 |

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

| Funding Source | Evidence-Based Program | Total |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Title I | \$117,658 | \$117,658 |
| Total | \$117,658 | \$117,658 |

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Increase student engagement.

G1.B1 Poor attendance, teachers not receptive to student engagement strategies/structures, poor writing abilities of students, lack of monetary resources, decrease number of parents who are able to participate in Parental Involvement activities.

G1.B1.S1 Professional Development activities are provided twice a month to provide strategies for instructional staff members to enhance student engagement in the classroom environment. We are reaching out to neighboring businesses to develop new school community partnerships. We are also increasing the number of parental involvement activities, as well as offering activities at different times of the day to accommodate the busy schedules of our parents.

Action Step 1

Provide numerous resources and training opportunities for our instructional staff members.

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Southern Regional Education Bureau, Florida Inclusion Network, Technological and Instructional Supplemental Academic Programs

Funding Source

Title I

Amount Needed

\$117,658