

Sarasota County Schools

Pine View School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	29

Pine View School

1 PYTHON PATH, Osprey, FL 34229

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/pineview

Demographics

Principal: Stephen Covert

Start Date for this Principal: 9/23/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 2-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (94%) 2017-18: A (94%) 2016-17: A (93%) 2015-16: A (93%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	29

Pine View School

1 PYTHON PATH, Osprey, FL 34229

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/pineview

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School 2-12	No	10%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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.

The mission of Pine View School is to provide a qualitatively different learning environment that nurtures a passion for intellectual curiosity, that encourages risk-taking, independence and innovation, and that is committed to a tradition of academic excellence and social responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pine View is the premier school for arts and sciences dedicated to providing excellence in research-based teaching practices to foster intellectual, social and emotional growth in gifted students.

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
Covert, Stephen	Principal	Oversee all operations of the school.
Allen, Tricia	Assistant Principal	Curriculum 2-12
Abela, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Middle School Assistant Principal
Marcotte, Kate	Assistant Principal	High School Assistant Principal
Sprinkle, Roy	Assistant Principal	Elementary School Assistant Principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/23/2020, Stephen Covert

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.*

8

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.*

33

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

116

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 2-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (94%) 2017-18: A (94%) 2016-17: A (93%) 2015-16: A (93%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	78	107	113	114	174	236	200	182	188	217	200	1809
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	3	1	3	4	5	5	1	0	10	10	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/23/2020

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	0	0	77	93	133	139	234	205	192	208	226	207	181	1895
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	3	3	2	9	4	3	5	12	15	28	31	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	4
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	4	3	2	9	4	5	6	6	16	22	29	106

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	0	0	77	93	133	139	234	205	192	208	226	207	181	1895
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	3	3	2	9	4	3	5	12	15	28	31	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	4
Level 1 on statewide 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	4	3	2	9	4	5	6	6	16	22	29	106

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	100%	67%	61%	99%	69%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	79%	60%	59%	79%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	80%	52%	54%	83%	58%	51%
Math Achievement	100%	70%	62%	100%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	90%	65%	59%	86%	64%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	86%	55%	52%	81%	57%	50%
Science Achievement	99%	63%	56%	98%	58%	53%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	100%	88%	78%	100%	85%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey												
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)											Total
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	100%	70%	30%	58%	42%
	2018	98%	68%	30%	57%	41%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	100%	67%	33%	58%	42%
	2018	99%	67%	32%	56%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	100%	68%	32%	56%	44%
	2018	99%	66%	33%	55%	44%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	99%	63%	36%	54%	45%
	2018	99%	63%	36%	52%	47%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	99%	64%	35%	52%	47%
	2018	99%	62%	37%	51%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	99%	66%	33%	56%	43%
	2018	100%	70%	30%	58%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	100%	65%	35%	55%	45%
	2018	99%	66%	33%	53%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	99%	63%	36%	53%	46%
	2018	99%	65%	34%	53%	46%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	99%	73%	26%	62%	37%
	2018	99%	72%	27%	62%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	99%	72%	27%	64%	35%
	2018	100%	71%	29%	62%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	99%	70%	29%	60%	39%
	2018	100%	72%	28%	61%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	99%	67%	32%	55%	44%
	2018	100%	66%	34%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
07	2019					
	2018	0%	73%	-73%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-100%				
08	2019	100%	65%	35%	46%	54%
	2018	100%	63%	37%	45%	55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		100%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	99%	65%	34%	53%	46%
	2018	99%	67%	32%	55%	44%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	98%	62%	36%	48%	50%
	2018	96%	62%	34%	50%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	77%	23%	67%	33%
2018	100%	75%	25%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	85%	15%	71%	29%
2018	100%	80%	20%	71%	29%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	77%	23%	70%	30%
2018	100%	76%	24%	68%	32%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	73%	27%	61%	39%
2018	100%	77%	23%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	69%	31%	57%	43%
2018	100%	71%	29%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	100	83		100	100		100				
ELL	100			100							
ASN	99	78	65	100	91	92	98	100	98	100	100
BLK	100	75		100							
HSP	100	78	86	100	94	94	100	100	96		
MUL	100	75	82	99	95	91	100	100	100	100	100
WHT	99	79	81	100	89	84	99	100	99	99	99
FRL	99	72	73	100	91	91	98	100	97	100	100

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	97	91	90	97	90		94				
ASN	100	86	87	100	91	84	100	100	100	100	94
BLK	100	82		100	80						
HSP	99	81	89	100	87	89	98	100	100	100	100
MUL	99	86	96	100	88	90	95	100	100	100	100
WHT	99	78	83	100	88	89	98	100	100	100	99
FRL	99	81	84	100	88	85	97	100	100	100	96

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	100	69		100	86	92	100				
ASN	98	85	82	100	93	83	99	100	100	100	100
BLK	100	100		100	100						
HSP	100	81	94	100	84	85	98	100	100	100	100
MUL	100	82	86	100	90	88	97	100	100		
WHT	99	77	80	100	84	78	98	100	100	99	97
FRL	99	75	82	99	82	74	100	98	100	100	100

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	94
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	1030
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	97
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	100
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	92
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	94
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	95
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	93
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	93
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data from 2019 showed Integration of Knowledge and Ideas was the lowest reporting category across ELA grade levels. Math reporting categories varied by subject. Science collective averages slipped in reporting categories. Although the overall percent proficient remained constant or improved.

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

ELA 8th grade dropped from 100% in 2018 to 99% in 2019. Math grades 3, 4 and 5 declined from 100% proficiency to 99%.

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.

NA

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

Biology maintained the 100% pass rate, and increased the scale score by 9 points.

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

Attendance

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

1. Engaging students in the concurrent learning model.
2. Math reporting categories for 6th grade, Algebra I and Geometry that are below 80% collective mastery.
3. Science reporting categories in grades 5 and 8 which have decreased slightly over the last year.
4. Increasing the number of students in AP courses earning a 4 or a 5.
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although 99% to 100% of our students scored proficient or higher in each grade level for ELA overall, we have analyzed specific reporting categories in which students collectively scored below 80% proficiency for each grade level. Integration of Knowledge and Ideas is below 80% for 3rd, 4th, 6th, 9th and 10th grades.

Measurable Outcome: Grade levels will increase the percent proficient in the Integration of Knowledge and Ideas category.
 3rd- 75% to 80%
 4th- 75% to 80%
 6th- 73% to 80%
 9th- 73% to 80%
 10th- 73% to 80%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: ELA, Social Studies, Science and CTE teachers will utilize PLCs to plans lessons, examine student data and student work samples, continuously monitoring student development in loK&I over the course of the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie's meta-analysis indicates collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 (nearly 4 times a full year's growth). Formative assessment has an effect size of .90 (double year's growth) and feedback for students has an effect size of 1.13 (triple). Working in teams to analyze student data, work samples and to plan instruction will increase opportunities for teachers to create instruction moving students forward.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will examine FSA, iReady and USA Test Prep data at the beginning of the year and after each benchmark assessment.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Initial and ongoing data will be utilized by teachers in each subject to create instructional plans specifically for instruction on loK&I.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Student work samples will be analyzed during PLCs for collective scoring and use in instructional planning.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

District dashboards will be used to identify first quartile students and students who did not make a learning gain the previous year.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Small group and 1:1 instruction will be designed to assist students.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will provide students with deficits extra help during lunch and through iReady and USA TP.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ELA Program Specialist will visit each ELA classroom in MS and HS, providing feedback to administration on areas of focus for Classroom Walk-Throughs.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although 99% to 100% of our students scored proficient or higher overall in each grade level for Math between 3rd grade and Geometry, we have analyzed specific reporting categories in which students collectively scored below 80% proficiency for each grade or subject area.

Grade levels or subjects will increase percent proficient in any area earning below 80% collective mastery.

Measurable Outcome: 6th- Geometry 75% to 80%
Algebra I- Functions and Modeling 73% to 80%; Statistics & Number System 74% to 80%
Geometry- Congruence, Similarities, Right Triangles and Trig 78% to 80%; Circles, Geometry, Measurement and Properties with Equations 76% to 80%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize PLCs to plan lessons, examine student data and work samples, monitoring student development in the categories of concern over the course of the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie's meta-analysis indicates collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 (nearly 4 times a full year's growth). Formative assessment has an effect size of .90 (double year's growth) and feedback for students has an effect size of 1.13 (triple). Working in teams to analyze student data, work samples and to plan instruction will increase opportunities for teachers to create instruction moving students forward.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will examine FSA, iReady, Algebra Nation and USA Test Prep data at the beginning of the year and after each benchmark assessment.

Person Responsible Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Initial and ongoing data will be used to create instructional plans.

Person Responsible Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Student work samples will be utilized during PLCs for collective scoring and use in instructional planning.

Person Responsible Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

District dashboards will be used to identify first quartile students and students who did not make a learning gain the previous year.

Person Responsible Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Students with deficits will be provided with extra help sessions at lunch and through iReady, USA TP, and Algebra Nation.

Person Responsible Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

The Math Program Specialist will visit each math classroom in MS and HS, providing feedback to administration on areas of focus for Classroom Walk-Throughs.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Although 99% of PV's students are proficient in grade 5 Science and 98% proficient in grade 8 science, and no reporting category had a collective student score of less than 80%, we have analyzed specific reporting categories from 2019 data in which students' collective scores slipped from the previous year's scores.

5th grade:

Nature of Science- 90% collective average, from 97% previous year.

Physical Science- 88% collective average, from 94% previous year.

Life Science- 88% collective average, from 93% previous year.

8th Grade:

Nature of Science- 85% collective average, from 88% previous year.

Life Science-80% collective average, from 87% previous year.

Biology- 100% pass rate, no category below 80% collective average, and raised scale score 9 points.

5th grade:

Nature of Science- 90% to 95%

Physical Science- 88% to 93%

Life Science- 88% to 90%

Measurable Outcome:

8th Grade:

Nature of Science 85% to 88%

Life Science 80% to 87%

Biology:

Maintain 100% pass rate and scale score increase

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will utilize PLCs to plan lessons, and examine student work samples, progress monitoring student development in the categories of concern over the course of the year. The elementary level will continue to implement new tools and resources pertaining to the new science text (2nd year implementation). Elementary Science Program Specialist, Cheri Dame, will continue to work with our teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

John Hattie's meta-analysis indicates collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 (nearly 4 times a full year's growth). Formative assessment has an effect size of .90 (double year's growth) and feedback for students has an effect size of 1.13 (triple). Working in teams to analyze student data, work samples and to plan instruction will increase opportunities for teachers to create instruction moving students forward.

Action Steps to Implement

5th grade teachers will collaborate extensively on new text resources and methods.

Person Responsible Roy Sprinkle (roy.sprinkle@sarasotacountyschools.net)

5th and 8th grade teachers will continue collaborating with district Program Specialist to plan and strengthen unit development.

Person Responsible Roy Sprinkle (roy.sprinkle@sarasotacountyschools.net)

5th and 8th grade teachers will examine 2019 FSA data and science unit test results at the beginning of the year and after each benchmark assessment.

Person Responsible Roy Sprinkle (roy.sprinkle@sarasotacountyschools.net)

5th and 8th grade student work samples will be analyzed during PLCs for use in instructional planning.

Person Responsible Roy Sprinkle (roy.sprinkle@sarasotacountyschools.net)

District dashboards will be used to identify first quartile students and students who did not make a learning gain and plan for small group or 1:1 instruction designed to assist student growth.

Person Responsible Roy Sprinkle (roy.sprinkle@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although Pine View students earn the highest average LEOC scores in the county, our performance has declined slightly in both subject areas over the past 4 years.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Government mean score from 78% to 83%.
Increase Economics mean score from 72% to 80%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will work in PLCs to plan lessons, examine student data and student work samples, progress monitoring student development in categories of concern over the course of the school year. District SS Program Specialist will work with 12th grade teachers to review assessment data and strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie's meta-analysis indicates collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 (nearly 4 times a full year's growth). Formative assessment has an effect size of .90 (double year's growth) and feedback for students has an effect size of 1.13 (triple). Working in teams to analyze student data, work samples and to plan instruction will increase opportunities for teachers to create instruction moving students forward.

Action Steps to Implement

The SS Program Specialist will work with 12th grade teacher to strengthen unit planning and monitoring.

Person Responsible: Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

12th grade teachers will examine previous LEOC data and analyze chapter test results and utilize Learn Smart to monitor student progress and influence teacher planning. LS provides self-monitoring for students and feedback is built into the program.

Person Responsible: Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Continue to decrease chronic absenteeism for 11th and 12th grade students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase students in the satisfactory attendance categories:
12th-
11th-

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitor student attendance and communicate with students and parents.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Attendance has been linked by research to student achievement and academic outcomes. Improving attendance at a school as academically advanced as Pine View may serve to help increase learning gains, which is more difficult with high-level learners. Focus on reducing chronic absenteeism became a national priority in 2015 under the Obama administration. "Reducing chronic absenteeism under the Every Child Succeeds Act" published by the Hamilton Project and the Brookings Institute, argues that what gets monitored, gets accomplished. The report provides multiple ways states and districts can begin looking at their attendance issues and developing plans tailored to the specific community.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly monitoring of student absences

Person Responsible: Maureen Borden (maureen.borden@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Individual meetings with students of concern

Person Responsible: Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Provision of gradation of consequences for absences.

Person Responsible: Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Students with 9 absences per semester are required to provide doctor's notes for absences.

Person Responsible: Maureen Borden (maureen.borden@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Loss of parking privileges for 11th and 12th grade students who exhibit chronic absenteeism.

Person Responsible: Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Creation of a central plan to address outreach from the school stakeholders to the community and increase diversity awareness and appreciation.

Measurable Outcome: Currently planned as remote events:
 1. Local Special Olympics event
 2. Veteran's Day breakfast and celebration
 3. Gifted Conferences

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carole McLaughlin (carole.mclaughlin@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: In addition to continuing our support of the local Special Olympics event, Pine View will hold a Veteran's Day celebration for active and retired veterans. The History Day simulation will be held remotely this year and students are currently deciding on a theme. Finally, four Gifted Conferences are offered to all interested participants from Sarasota, Manatee and Port Charlotte. The focus of this year's conferences will be access, equity and opportunity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The highlighted events include diverse groups from the community: remote speakers, special needs children and local veterans.

Action Steps to Implement

Special Olympics is scheduled and student/staff volunteers are solicited.

Person Responsible Carole McLaughlin (carole.mclaughlin@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Veterans' Day celebration is organized through elementary leadership.

Person Responsible Roy Sprinkle (roy.sprinkle@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Gifted Conferences will be held remotely and attendance from Sarasota, Manatee and Port Charlotte are invited.

Person Responsible Stephen Covert (stephen.covert@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Focus on Social Emotional Learning and Positive Behavior Support

Measurable Outcome: Completion of Mental Health Modules
 Kognito Training for all staff
 Student participation in community outreach events

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kate Marcotte (kate.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers and students will work together through the Diversity Club and other organizations to develop plans to increase diversity awareness, community outreach programs and action steps for our school in terms of Social Emotional Learning and a positive school culture.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: "Socially and emotionally competent people are adaptive, regulate their behavior, respond to situations in appropriate ways and seek out opportunities to build and strengthen their communities." Nancy Frey

Action Steps to Implement

Diversity Club meetings and action plan.

Person Responsible Stephen Covert (stephen.covert@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Social Emotional Learning plan developed in conjunction with community Social Blackbelt author and trainer.

Person Responsible Stephen Covert (stephen.covert@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Kognito suicide awareness training of all staff.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Mental Health module completion by all students facilitated through Suite 360 and Advisory teachers.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Continue to increase student access to rigorous coursework.

Measurable Outcome:

1. Increased enrollment in all rigorous courses from 19/20 to 20/21 as measured by DE, AP and CTW registrations.
2. Increase percent of students scoring 3 through 5 in AP classes from 88% to 91%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynn Halcomb (lynn.halcomb@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Increase awareness about DE and AP through registration efforts, the course catalog and AP night. Use of new AP Classroom, a progress monitoring tool, will provide students with assistance in deficit areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Exposure to rigorous curriculum in high school is the most accurate predictor of post-secondary academic success, over parent education level, individual test scores, class rank or GPA. The College Board reported in the 2014 Report to the Nation that students who experience success in an AP course are more likely to graduate college on time and earn higher GPAs.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide information to parents about rigorous coursework options.

Person

Responsible Lynn Halcomb (lynn.halcomb@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Include rigorous coursework results in the registration information given to students.

Person

Responsible Lynn Halcomb (lynn.halcomb@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Provide an AP Night for parents interested in exploring AP courses.

Person

Responsible Lori Wiley (lori.wiley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Train teachers to use the progress monitoring tool.

Person

Responsible Lori Wiley (lori.wiley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Work with individual teachers to review their data and include their results in their individual PD Plan.

Person

Responsible Lori Wiley (lori.wiley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Provide classroom and counseling support for students based on progress monitoring evidence.

Person

Responsible Lori Wiley (lori.wiley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Provide PSAT to 8th-11th grade students without cost to students.

Person

Responsible Lori Wiley (lori.wiley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Mock exams for all APs and use of advisory period for counseling about scheduling.

Person Responsible Lori Wiley (lori.wiley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#9. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Engage students in the concurrent learning model.

Measurable Outcome:
 1. Teachers will be proficient in use of Zoom, Blackboard and Teams for concurrent learning.
 2. Teachers will learn to provide instruction which engages traditional and remote students equally.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher will be provided enhanced supports through in-house and district specialists to train in technological areas of deficit. Teachers will PLC, and use TEAMS and email to collaborate about workarounds and problem-solving methods for the new learning model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie's meta-analysis indicates collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 (nearly 4 times a full year's growth). Formative assessment has an effect size of .90 (double year's growth) and feedback for students has an effect size of 1.13 (triple). Working in teams to analyze student data, work samples and to plan instruction will increase opportunities for teachers to create instruction moving students forward.

Action Steps to Implement

Survey staff about their needs using FORMS.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Rounding by admin to get a sense of teacher needs.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Classroom walk-throughs with admin and district Program Specialists to determine needs.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Specific days designated to each subject and grade level to provide support.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

The school will devise specific teacher-requested PD opportunities on the additional district-provided PD days.

Person Responsible Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All of the improvement categories are listed above.

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 View values each stakeholder and makes broad efforts to include teachers, parents, students, community members, higher education institutions and social services in the creation of our school environment. Parents at each level are invited to book studies, parent coffees, school events, and decision-making bodies such as PVA, SDMT, and SAC. Students sit on SAC and run the Diversity and History Clubs, both instrumental in the development of our school culture. Teachers sit on SAC, SDMT, and PVA, and their advice is sought regularly for input on current initiatives through Principal's Brown Bag Lunches, FORMS Surveys, and informal rounding. Community members are regularly included and welcomed at our school in the form of guest speakers, honorees, trainers, and supervisor of student internships. Volunteers, both informal (parent help at school) and formal (mentors) are regularly welcomed and utilized. PV collaborates regularly with higher learning institutions to provide dual enrollment opportunities for our students. All of these together contribute to the development of a healthy school climate.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$8,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0021 - Pine View School	School Improvement Funds		\$8,000.00

		<i>Notes: Substitute teacher funds for teachers to observe one another and collaborate with other teachers on engaging students in the concurrent learning model. Two thousand dollars will be requested for each of the four main content areas in grades 6-12..</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math			\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science			\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies			\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Attendance			\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement			\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE
			0021 - Pine View School		
		<i>Notes: Gifted Conferences</i>			
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning			\$3,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE
			0021 - Pine View School	School Improvement Funds	
		<i>Notes: Social Black Belt training</i>			
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement			\$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement			\$0.00
				Total:	\$14,000.00