

Pasco County Schools

# Pine View Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Pine View Elementary School

5333 PARKWAY BLVD, Land O Lakes, FL 34639

<https://pves.pasco.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Jennifer Jaworski**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Pine View Elementary School

5333 PARKWAY BLVD, Land O Lakes, FL 34639

<https://pves.pasco.k12.fl.us>

### School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	41%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

### School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	C	A

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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 PVES community will develop the knowledge and skills to become caring, lifelong learners through inquisitive, collaborative and reflective practices by respecting diversity and becoming globally minded citizens who are empowered to take action.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Collaborate and communicate to learn within and outside of the school community.  
 Take ownership for learning and reflect on progress.  
 Think critically to understand and solve the real world problems.  
 Utilize a variety of tools and resources to enhance learning.  
 Build strong content knowledge and apply learning to new contexts.

### 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
Moore, Kathryn	Principal	Principal will lead all instruction, manage operations, and collaborate with stakeholders to ensure the success of all students.
Reynolds, Mary	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/20/2020, Jennifer Jaworski

**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.*

1

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

50

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	81	84	84	103	88	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	9	8	9	8	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	10	8	11	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
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	11	13	12	16	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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**

Monday 7/20/2020

**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	84	72	96	96	104	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	7	6	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

**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	5	3	1	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

**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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	84	72	96	96	104	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	7	6	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

**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	5	3	1	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

**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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	62%	58%	57%	73%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	64%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	54%	53%	49%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	60%	63%	73%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	61%	62%	71%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	51%	55%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	53%	53%	62%	49%	51%

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	60%	7%	58%	9%
	2018	68%	57%	11%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	59%	8%	58%	9%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	59%	6%	62%	3%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	62%	7%	64%	5%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	67%	56%	11%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	33	39	26	50	40	9				
ELL	27			55							
BLK	48	56		52	67						
HSP	48	46	46	56	66	47	28				
WHT	69	57	57	71	69	43	67				
FRL	46	47	50	50	61	45	36				
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	32	34	5	28	38	24	44				
BLK	56			63							
HSP	55	46	32	53	49	21	50				
WHT	72	51	13	73	67	30	74				
FRL	58	51	28	57	61	28	50				
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	33	44	43	29	53	46	11				
ELL	55			82							
BLK	91			82							
HSP	62	64	50	69	77	67	58				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	76	64	47	74	69	50	63				
FRL	67	64	52	69	77	67	47				

**ESSA Data**

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	62
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	52
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 lowest performance was students in the lowest quartile math achievement (48%) and Science Achievement (51%). Although our lowest area was math lowest quartile they made significant gains from previous year (+22%). Science decrease by 15% this may have been related to lack of focus on the mastery of science standards.

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

Our greatest decline was Science Achievement with a decline of 15%. The lack of focus on science standards may have contributed to the decline.

**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.**

Our greatest achievement gap was in Science by 2 percentage points.

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

Lowest quartile ELA students made the most gains, gains were 32 percentage points. We attribute this to the focus on ELA interventions. We used ACT Now, a research based intervention program.

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

Student achievement level on FSA was our greatest concern especially in the area of 5th grade science.

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

1. 5th grade Science Achievement (SWD)
2. Lowest Quartile Math (SWD)
3. Math Achievement Data had 2 point decline
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** To ensure instructional integrity for students with disabilities in the areas of ELA, Math and Science.

**Measurable Outcome:** Decrease the percent of students scoring below a level 2 as measured by FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kathryn Moore (kjmoore@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Continue to use ACT Now, a research based intervention, for ELA. Refine 5th grade intervention to focus on division strategies and fact fluency strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** ACT Now is a research intervention strategy that proved successful in prior year. This strategy for annotating text carries over to multiple content areas. Division is a core standard in math instruction in 5th grade that determines success on assessments. Fact fluency impacts efficiency and problem solving.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The school leadership team will continue to implement timely monitoring of school based data and provide direct feedback on instructional practices.**

**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.



All stakeholder groups are kept informed through monthly committee meetings. Input is gleaned from conversations, surveys, and data. Data sources include staff and student Gallup data and the collection of parent survey data.

Overall, our climate and culture is positive based on this data. Parents indicated they would like to add more opportunity for parent to parent interactions. Our PTO and SAC committee will work on plans to link grade level parents.

As a staff we will continue with PBIS, and district level SEL trainings that strengthen our core instruction related to student and staff well-being and engagement.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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