
Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Pine Grove Elementary School

14411 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/pges>

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Kalamant

Start Date for this Principal: 9/30/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 99% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| 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 Hernando 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Pine Grove Elementary School

14411 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/pges>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">39%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | C | C | C | B |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

Pine Grove Elementary School believes in promoting an active partnership between school, home, and community. Our goal is to increase student achievement by encouraging a positive learning environment, while creating a caring, inviting, and enriching place to learn.

We strive to: B ecome an
E mpowered and
S elf-motivated community for
T oday and tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

P olite
R esponsible
I n control
D o your best
E arn and give respect

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Other | |
| Haripersad, Angelina | Other | Title I Facilitator; responsible for the fiduciary oversight of federal expenditures |
| Reed, Galathea | Other | Assessment Teacher provides, analyzes and disaggregates data for individual teachers and grade level teams, works closely with leadership team to focus on areas of concern, supports MTSS, and participates in weekly school-based leadership team meetings. |
| Pagano, Nick | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal assists and facilitates weekly school-based leadership team meetings, team leaders' meetings and faculty meeting. The AP oversees school-wide instructional practices in all levels, oversees the MTSS process and coordinates professional development. |
| Reynolds, Katie | Other | Elementary Assistant assists in the coordination of services and programs including screening and identification processes, further assessment, evaluation and assignment of appropriate strategies and/or programs to students. MTSS Coordinator: Lead school wide MTSS meetings. Assists teachers in making tiered groups. Presents LQ growth data to Leadership team. |
| Cornell, Carla | Instructional Coach | Instructional Practice Coach facilitates lesson planning with grade level teams. IP Coach will review lesson plans and provide constructive criticism. The IP Coach will actively participate in identifying classroom "look-fors" directly connected to the school improvement goals. |
| Kalamant, Thomas | Principal | Principal facilitates weekly school-based leadership meetings, team leader's meetings and faculty meetings, and oversees school-wide instructional practices in all levels. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/30/2019, Thomas Kalamant

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.*

2

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 99% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 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 | 0 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

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 | 140 | 152 | 142 | 143 | 140 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 872 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 7 | 16 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 15 | 4 | 16 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 12 | 19 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 19 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |

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 | 16 | 6 | 8 | 18 | 34 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 140 | 152 | 142 | 143 | 140 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 872 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 7 | 16 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 15 | 4 | 16 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 12 | 19 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 19 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |

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 | 16 | 6 | 8 | 18 | 34 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 49% | 54% | 57% | 53% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 52% | 53% | 58% | 51% | 54% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | 52% | 53% | 56% | 54% | 52% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Achievement | 56% | 58% | 63% | 65% | 63% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 59% | 57% | 62% | 63% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 48% | 51% | 58% | 50% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 63% | 54% | 53% | 54% | 54% | 51% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 49% | 57% | -8% | 58% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 62% | -5% | 57% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 45% | 59% | -14% | 58% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 53% | -6% | 56% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 49% | 52% | -3% | 56% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 53% | -2% | 55% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 53% | 62% | -9% | 62% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 67% | -5% | 62% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 51% | 62% | -11% | 64% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 60% | -3% | 62% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 57% | 54% | 3% | 60% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 56% | 8% | 61% | 3% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | | | -7% | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | 0% | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 59% | 55% | 4% | 53% | 6% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 56% | -5% | 55% | -4% |
| 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 31 | 48 | 50 | 34 | 39 | 42 | 50 | | | | |
| ELL | 16 | 17 | | 21 | 31 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 47 | | 41 | 39 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 36 | 42 | 50 | 54 | 29 | 60 | | | | |
| MUL | 38 | 45 | | 65 | 73 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 56 | 53 | 58 | 60 | 48 | 63 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 51 | 52 | 48 | 52 | 37 | 62 | | | | |
| 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 | 30 | 43 | 53 | 49 | 47 | 45 | 47 | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 46 | | 47 | 62 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 41 | 55 | 48 | 48 | 42 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 54 | | 62 | 54 | | 45 | | | | |
| MUL | 53 | 27 | | 71 | 45 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 49 | 53 | 64 | 53 | 43 | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 50 | 48 | 58 | 52 | 43 | 46 | | | | |
| 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 | 26 | 45 | 45 | 35 | 45 | 50 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | | | 17 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 62 | | 64 | 54 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 59 | | 64 | 59 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | | | 82 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 49 | 56 | 63 | 62 | 65 | 55 | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 48 | 49 | 55 | 61 | 64 | 58 | 46 | | | | |

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 | 53 |
| 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 | 373 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |
| 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 | 21 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |

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 |

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 | 43 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 45 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 55 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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.

Our math lowest quartile was the area of lowest performance. A decrease of 1 percentage point was observed from 43% in 2018 to 42% in 2019. Overall math achievement decreased from 63% in 2018 to 56% in 2019.

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

Math achievement decreased 63% to 56%. PLC's and data chats were not done with fidelity during the second half of the year due to demanding behavioral issues.

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.

A 9 percentage point gap exists between Pine Grove's math bottom quartile and the state average math bottom quartile. PLC's and data chats were not done with fidelity during the second half of the year due to demanding behavioral issues.

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

Science achievement increased 10%, which is also 10% above the state average. Grade levels conducted "science days" on our early release days, increased science instruction time beginning in January, trained teachers on blending science and reading curriculum.

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

Two areas of concern are attendance and referrals.

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

1. Instructional Practices
2. Culture
3. Attendance
4. Behavior

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Standards-aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that help align instruction with the standards. ELA achievement decreased from 53% to 49% and Math achievement decreased from 63% to 56%. Additionally, there is an achievement gap for the ELL subgroup: ELA - 33 percentage points, Math - 35 percentage points. Finally, district walkthrough data indicates that instruction was not standards aligned 58% of the time during the fall walkthrough and instruction was not aligned 29% of the time during the winter walkthrough.

Measurable Outcome:

Achievement on the ELA state assessment will increase by 4 percentage points and achievement on Math state assessment will increase by 7 percentage points. ELL subgroup will close the gap by 1/4 on the ELA state assessment (8 percentage points). The ELL subgroup will close the gap by 1/4 on the Math state assessment (9 percentage points).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Facilitated, collaborative planning for ELA and Math will be focused on unpacking the standard, developing common formative assessments, and examining test item specifications.

In order to provide students the opportunity to engage in rigorous, standards-based tasks, teachers will be supported through a structure for collaborative planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

<https://www.edvestors.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/EdVestors-Making-Space-The-Value-of-Teacher-Collaboration-2014.pdf>
<https://www.schoology.com/blog/teacher-collaboration>
https://info.schoology.com/ohio-blended-collaborative-webinar-recording.html?utm_source=schoology-blog&utm_medium=web?utm_content=taking-blended-learning-beyond-the-pdf

Action Steps to Implement

Administration team will determine common planning time procedures.

Person Responsible

Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administration will contact district coach to determine planning schedule.

Person Responsible

Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administration and IP Coach will attend planning sessions.

Person Responsible

Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Lesson plans will be completed two weeks in advance and uploaded to OneNote.

Person Responsible

Nick Pagano (pagano_n@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administration will complete observations to determine standards aligned instruction and standards based lessons are occurring. Content coaches and/or SBLT members will complete walkthroughs to collect data on implementation planned during collaborative planning. Trend data collected will be shared during SBLT

meetings.

Mr. Kalamant will meet with IP Coach to discuss observations weekly. Individual feedback will be provided based on need.

Person Responsible Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Leadership team will create criteria for look-fors designed around standards alignment including common board configuration.

Person Responsible Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

SBLT will review progress monitoring data to determine needed professional development.

Person Responsible Galathea Reed (reed_g@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Attendance data from 2019 reflects a school wide decline in attendance. Kindergarten; quarter one 29%, quarter two 50% and quarter three 60%. Fourth grade; quarter two 30%, quarter four 50%. Attendance in the subgroups also decreased. ELL; quarter two 43% and quarter three 52%. Hispanic; quarter two 38% and quarter three 50%. SWD; quarter one 41%, quarter two 53%, and quarter three 57%. EBD; quarter one 73% quarter two 73% and quarter three 82%.
The Student Engagement Survey from 2019 and 2020 reflect the areas in needs of support are relevance and relationships with peers.

Measurable Outcome: Quarterly school attendance data will show an increase in attendance. Grade level and subgroup attendance will remain below 49% in each quarter.
The Student Engagement Survey for 2021 will reflect a HCSD Score of 3.0 or higher in the areas of relevance and relationships with peers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Quarterly perfect attendance incentives will be provided to the appropriate students. The Sanford Harmony program will be implemented school wide interwoven throughout content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research based strategies to address absenteeism increase student attendance. Research states students participating in both the relationship building activities and everyday activities of Sanford Harmony benefit both socially and academically.

Evidence-based Strategy: <https://www.eschoolnews.com/2018/07/24/9-things-schools-can-do-today-to-improve-attendance/2/>
<https://www.sanfordharmony.org/teachers/>
<https://ofy.org/blog/four-major-benefits-of-social-emotional-learning/>

Action Steps to Implement

Data entry will pull attendance report every nine weeks to identify student who have been in attendance 90% or higher.

Person Responsible Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Attendance guidance counselor will provide student recognition every nine weeks.

Person Responsible Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Training on Sanford Harmony will be provided during PLCs utilizing "Train the trainer" and online webinars.

Person Responsible Nick Pagano (pagano_n@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administration or SBLT designee will observe Sanford Harmony practices and/or evidence in classrooms during walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Thomas Kalamant (kalamant_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Evidence of Sanford Harmony will be included in teacher lesson plans.

Person Responsible Nick Pagano (pagano_n@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school wide improvement priorities include: Instructional Practices, Culture, Attendance and Behavior. Action steps assigned to the two areas of focus include activities directly connected with these improvement priorities. Addressing social emotional needs of students and staff will result in improved school culture.

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.

Pine Grove Elementary builds a positive school culture and environment through communication, family events, and relationships with community partners. Weekly global phone calls are sent out to parents/guardians to share information about the upcoming week. Teachers utilize Remind 101 and/or Class Dojo to communicate daily/weekly to ensure parents are aware of current events in the classrooms. PGE regularly updates social media platforms to communicate with parents/guardians and the community.

PGE hosts several family events throughout the year. These events include Title 1 Family Nights, Fall and Spring Festivals, Holidays/seasonal evening events and Family movie nights. At this time, Pine Grove is working towards creating digital events due to current circumstances.

Pine Grove Elementary fosters relationships with community partners. Several community partners donate school supplies to assist in meeting our students' needs, while other local businesses provide coupons for student awards for academic achievement. Our local businesses also support teachers throughout the year by providing meals and treats to encourage our educators.

Working with the middle school located directly next to PGE, our fifth grade students enjoy visiting the middle school campus and learning about the academic and elective classes that are offered. The middle school principal visits PGE towards the end of the year to welcome incoming fifth graders. Pine Grove Elementary has also created a partnership with the high school located on the same street. Fifth and fourth grade students enjoy attending the homecoming pep rally and other assemblies held on the high school campus throughout the year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.