# Pine View School



# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Pine View School

## Demographics

**Principal: Stephen Covert**                    Start Date for this Principal: 9/23/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>2-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | Special Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 15% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (94%)<br><br>2017-18: A (94%)<br><br>2016-17: A (93%)<br><br>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

# 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** <br> (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** <br> (per MSID File) | Combination School <br> 2-12 |
| **Primary Service Type** <br> (per MSID File) | Special Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically** <br> **Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** <br> (as reported on Survey 3) | 15% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** <br> (subgroups with 10 or more students) <br> (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities <br> English Language Learners <br> Asian Students <br> Black/African American Students <br> Hispanic Students <br> Multiracial Students <br> White Students <br> Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (94%) <br><br> 2017-18: A (94%) <br><br> 2016-17: A (93%) <br><br> 2015-16: A (93%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [Lucinda Thompson](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](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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | | | | | | | Grade Level | | | | | | | |
| 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 | |

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | |

## 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.<br>3rd- 75% to 80%<br>4th- 75% to 80%<br>6th- 73% to 80%<br>9th- 73% to 80%<br>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 IoK&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 IoK&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. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Grade levels or subjects will increase percent proficient in any area earning below 80% collective mastery.<br>6th- Geometry 75% to 80%<br>Algebra I- Functions and Modeling 73% to 80%; Statistics & Number System 74% to 80%<br>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 will 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** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | 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.<br><br>5th grade:<br><br>Nature of Science- 90% collective average, from 97% previous year.<br><br>Physical Science- 88% collective average, from 94% previous year.<br><br>Life Science- 88% collective average, from 93% previous year.<br><br>8th Grade:<br><br>Nature of Science- 85% collective average, from 88% previous year.<br><br>Life Science-80% collective average, from 87% previous year.<br><br>Biology- 100% pass rate, no category below 80% collective average, and raised scale score 9 points. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 5th grade:<br>Nature of Science- 90% to 95%<br>Physical Science- 88% to 93%<br>Life Science- 88% to 90%<br><br>8th Grade:<br>Nature of Science 85% to 88%<br>Life Science 80% to 87%<br><br>Biology:<br>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%.<br>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:<br>12th-<br>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:<br>1. Local Special Olympics event<br>2. Veteran's Day breakfast and celebration<br>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<br>Kognito Training for all staff<br>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.<br>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.<br>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 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *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..* | | | |
| 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 | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0021 - Pine View School | | | $2,500.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Gifted Conferences* | | | |
| 7 | III.A. | **Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning** | | | | **$3,500.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0021 - Pine View School | School Improvement Funds | | $3,500.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Social Black Belt training* | | | |
| 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** |