

Sarasota County Schools

Pine View School



2021-22 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	24
Positive Culture & Environment	30
Budget to Support Goals	31

Pine View School

1 PYTHON PATH, Osprey, FL 34229

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/pineview

Demographics

Principal: Stephen Covert

Start Date for this Principal: 6/26/2013

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	24
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	31

Pine View School

1 PYTHON PATH, Osprey, FL 34229

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/pineview

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School 2-12	No	11%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	39%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Covert, Stephen	Principal	To oversee all operations of the school. To align the curriculum, programs, resources and all decisions to the mission and vision of the school.
Allen, Tricia	Assistant Principal	Curriculum & Instruction 2-12
Marcotte, Lana	Assistant Principal	Middle School Assistant Principal
Abela, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Middle School Assistant Principal
Sprinkle, Roy	Assistant Principal	Elementary Assistant Principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/26/2013, 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

106

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,770

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

19

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	72	104	125	141	178	174	232	186	167	178	213	1770
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	1	3	2	1	11	6	8	13	10	27	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	1	4	1	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/1/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Students with two or more indicators 0 0 0 0 2 0 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	

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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				100%	67%	61%	99%	68%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				79%	60%	59%	80%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				80%	52%	54%	85%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				100%	70%	62%	100%	70%	61%
Math Learning Gains				90%	65%	59%	88%	64%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				86%	55%	52%	88%	59%	52%
Science Achievement				99%	63%	56%	98%	66%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				100%	88%	78%	100%	84%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	100%	70%	30%	58%	42%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	100%	67%	33%	58%	42%
Cohort Comparison		-100%				
05	2021					
	2019	100%	68%	32%	56%	44%
Cohort Comparison		-100%				
06	2021					
	2019	99%	63%	36%	54%	45%
Cohort Comparison		-100%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	99%	64%	35%	52%	47%
Cohort Comparison		-99%				
08	2021					
	2019	99%	66%	33%	56%	43%
Cohort Comparison		-99%				
09	2021					
	2019	100%	65%	35%	55%	45%
Cohort Comparison		-99%				
10	2021					
	2019	99%	63%	36%	53%	46%
Cohort Comparison		-100%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	99%	73%	26%	62%	37%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	99%	72%	27%	64%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-99%				
05	2021					
	2019	99%	70%	29%	60%	39%
Cohort Comparison		-99%				
06	2021					
	2019	99%	67%	32%	55%	44%
Cohort Comparison		-99%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-99%				
08	2021					
	2019	100%	65%	35%	46%	54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	99%	65%	34%	53%	46%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	98%	62%	36%	48%	50%
Cohort Comparison		-99%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	77%	23%	67%	33%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	85%	15%	71%	29%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	77%	23%	70%	30%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	73%	27%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	69%	31%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grades 2-8 used iReady data. Algebra and grade 5 of science used benchmark assessments. Grade 8 did not progress monitor. US History used USA Test Prep.

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	87%	95%	100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	99%	99%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	74%	92%	100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	99%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	90%	98%	99%
	Economically Disadvantaged	93%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71%	93%	97%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80%	93%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	99%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	87%	87%	99%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	93%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72%	90%	99%
	Economically Disadvantaged	85%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81%	85%	100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	76%	89%	98%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	NA	100%	100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	93%	87%	98%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75%	85%	99%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	89%	91%	98%
	Economically Disadvantaged	94%	94%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	99%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71%	75%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	94%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	99%	99%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	76%	85%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	100
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	89%	89%	99%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	99%	99%	100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	99%	99%	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	NA	NA	93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	93%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79%	87%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	95%	94%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	93%	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45%	75%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84	82	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	100%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	100	74		100	71						
ELL	100	87	82	100	71						
ASN	99	90	98	100	89	91	99	100	100	100	96
BLK	100			100							
HSP	99	69	68	99	83	88	89	100	92	100	100

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	100	84	100	99	82	67	100	100			
WHT	99	79	88	100	85	84	98	100	99	100	99
FRL	99	82	87	100	83	85	98	100	100	100	94
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
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	1031
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	86
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	88
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	97
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	100
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	90
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	92
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	94
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All subject scores remained relatively constant.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Reading: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas, particularly in 7th, 8th and 9th.
 Writing - Evidence & Elaboration, Purpose, Focus & Organization
 Attendance remains a concern for upperclassmen.
 8th Grade Science reporting category scores decreased in each section.
 Math Learning Gains were down slightly.
 The number of passing AP scores decreased 2 %.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We were pleased with the stability of our scores across the board considering the circumstances of concurrent teaching. We will continue to look at ways of increasing scores at the reporting category level, which gives us detailed information for targeted attention by grade level and over time.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

6th grade Writing scores made a 7% growth in Evidence & Elaboration.
 5th grade increased substantially in 2 reporting categories.
 ELA Learning gains increased by 8% for first quartile students.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

PLCs worked hard to target specific areas. Collaborative scoring for calibration on FSA Writing.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We are 100% accelerated.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

As a gifted magnet school committed to accelerating every student, there is no need to specifically offer PD related to acceleration. Every student is already accelerated at least one grade level.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Socratic Seminar training, Peer to Peer Walk-Through PD offers, and a book study on Belonging Through a Culture of Dignity.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although 97-100% of our students scored proficient or higher in each grade level for ELA overall, school leaders analyzed specific grading categories in which students collectively scored below 80% proficiency for each grade level. Specifically, Integration of Knowledge & Ideas is below 80% for grades 6, 7, 8, & 9.

Measurable Outcome: Grade levels will increase the percent proficient in the Integration of Knowledge & Ideas category.
 Grades 3-5 and 10 will maintain 80% or higher proficiency.
 6th- 75% to 80%
 7th- 78% to 80%
 8th- 77% to 80%
 9th- 73% to 80%

Monitoring: ELA, Science, and CTE teachers will utilize PLCs to plan lessons, as well as to examine data and work samples, while also continuously monitoring student development in IoK&I over the course of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Lana Marcotte and Tricia Allen will ask content area teachers to focus some of their PLCs on creation of IoK&I lesson plans and ask for submissions of exemplar lesson plans. Allen will also encourage the use of DBQs in ELA and Social Studies- a strategy which emphasizes the skills required in the target category. Teachers will be encouraged to implement Socratic Seminars using multiple texts.

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

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assign teachers to PLCs and monitor their goals/action plan for the school year. Teachers will create the PLC focus.
2. Meet with each elementary and SS PLC to show them the DBQ resources for their grade level. SS teachers will facilitate at least 3 DBQs this school year.
3. Schedule walk-throughs with Department Chairs and Program Specialists. Department Chairs will share insights and feedback with department members.
4. Monitor Peer 2 Peer efforts of staff.
5. Teachers will create lesson plans that reflect Integration of Knowledge and Ideas. Tricia Allen will request lesson plans that include Integration of Knowledge and Ideas from ELA, Science, and SS.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although students in grades 3-10 earned between 73% and 86% of the writing points available on the Writing FSA, school leaders drilled down to each reporting category to identify Evidence & Elaboration, as well as Purpose, Focus & Organization as the two categories on which to focus improvement efforts.
	The target is for students to earn 80% or more of the points available on the Writing FSA.
	Evidence & Elaboration
	4th- 64% to 80%
	5th- 67% to 80%
	7th- 70% to 80%
	9th- 73% to 80%
	10th- 73% to 80%
	Purpose, Focus & Organization
Measurable Outcome:	4th- 69% to 80%
	5th- 69% to 80%
	7th- 72% to 80%
	9th- 73% to 80%
	10th- 74% to 80%
	Total Writing Scores
	4th- 73% to 80%
	5th- 74% to 80%
	7th- 77% to 80%
	9th- 78% to 80%
	10th- 79% to 80%
Monitoring:	Administrators, Tricia Allen and Lana Marcotte, will participate in PD targeting calibration of scoring with the ELA teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers in ES, MS and HS will attend school-based writing calibrations with Program Specialists, during which teachers will grade common-prompt essays of colleagues and use FSA rubrics to calibrate grading technique and instructional planning for future lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's meta-analysis indicates collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57, which is nearly 4 times a school year's growth. Formative assessment has an effect size of .90 (double a 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 eachers to create instruction to move students forward.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers in grades 4-10 will participate in writing calibration training. Tricia Allen will schedule writing calibration activity with Program Specialists and ELA team members.

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

#3. 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:

1. Leadership book study on Belonging Through a Culture of Dignity to align school plans to district progress.
2. ESE Information Sharing Initiative
3. Pine View Team Virtual Race for Inclusion, raising money for Special Olympics
4. Staff lending library creation
5. Veteran's Day Celebration
6. Quarterly Gifted Workshops open to the tri-county area teachers.
7. Transition of 504 oversight from ESE office to School Counselors.
8. School counselor review of Suite 360 mental health modules for trigger-warnings and provision of services for students struggling with module contents.

Monitoring:

1. APC will organize the book study for Instructional Leaders 2-12.
2. ESE Department will monitor participation.
3. ESE Department will monitor and publicize donations.
4. Climate Survey will seek staff input about the new library.
5. Elementary Student Council will monitor the organization and facilitation of the event.
6. PD credit will be awarded by oversight facilitator, Kristin McCombie
7. ESE Administrator will oversee completion and implementation of 504 plans.
8. APC will monitor monthly trigger warning emails to staff by Counselors.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Pine View continues to support school, district and community efforts to develop a sense of being part of the greater community and the value of nurturing altruism within our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The highlighted events include diverse groups from the school and community and seeks to develop equity-minded leadership, staff and students.

Action Steps to Implement

The action steps are reflected in the monitoring portion above.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social Studies teachers will focus on Document-Based Questioning to build student achievement in the area of Integration of Knowledge & Ideas, in which students use multiple texts on a topic to analyze and evaluate the information. Social Studies teachers will also focus on implementing Socratic Seminars and other discourse strategies to build student speaking and listening skills. Writing skills are addressed through each strategy.

Measurable Outcome: Social Studies teachers will implement three DBQs or FRQs over the course of the school year and will facilitate at least one Socratic Seminar.

Monitoring: Social Studies teachers will utilize PLCs to plan DBQs, FRQs, and Socratic Seminars. PLC activities will include the examination of student data and work samples and the continuous monitoring of student development in IoK&I, speaking and listening over the course of the school year.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Tricia Allen will ask SS teachers to focus some of their PLCs on creation of DBQs, FRQs, and Socratic Seminars, and ask for submissions of exemplar lesson plans.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie's meta-analysis indicates collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57, which is nearly 4 times a school year's growth. Formative assessment has an effect size of .90 (double a 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 eachers to create instruction to move students forward.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet with SS teachers to go over the DBQ resource online and establish expectation of 3 DBQs/FRQs per year.
2. Organize classroom walk-throughs with Department Chair.
3. Request evidence of Integration of Knowledge and Ideas lessons at midyear conferences.
4. Volunteer to model Socratic Seminars in classrooms.
5. Provide feedback on seminars facilitated by teachers.

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

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of

Focus

1. (ES) Elementary teachers will increase progress monitoring efforts for Science.

Description and Rationale:

2. (MS) Increase proficiency scores for 8th grade Life Science students.
3. (HS) Increase the number of 4s and 5s in AP Science courses.

1. 3rd & 4th grade teachers will begin using the grade-level benchmarks and planning vertically with 5th grade teachers.
2. 8th grade Life Science proficiency scores will increase from 93% to 98%. The overall proficiency level for Life Science decreased last year, from 98% to 93%.

Measurable Outcome:

Nature of Science 82% to 85%
Earth/Space Science 80% to 85%
Physical Science 80%-85%

3. AP teachers will increase the numbers of 4s and 5s by 2%.

Monitoring:

1. APC will monitor new benchmark data and work with AP to facilitate vertical planning.
2. The Life Science test is based on three years of MS science. All levels of science teachers will create common assessments and progress monitor data.
3. AP teachers will work in PLCs to discuss AP Classroom tools and student progress. APC will discuss progress at midyear meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Roy Sprinkle will ask elementary teachers to focus a portion of their PLCs on implementation of the benchmarks and data analysis. Vertical planning times will also be scheduled.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Hattie's meta-analysis indicates collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57, which is nearly 4 times a school year's growth. Formative assessment has an effect size of .90 (double a 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 eachers to create instruction to move students forward.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide elementary teachers the standards alignment document and discuss new grade 3 nd 4 progress monitoring requirements.
2. Visit Life Science PLC and establish the need for common assessments.

Person Responsible

Tricia Allen (tricia.allen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math teachers will participate and will fully participate in the district textbook adoption process, using PLC and department meeting time to analyze standards and proposed textbooks.
Measurable Outcome:	An appropriate textbook for Gifted learners will be selected.
Monitoring:	The AP over Math will attend all adoption meetings and be part of the selection process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Vest (kelly.vest@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The selection will be based on BEST standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	BEST standards will be in full implementation, which makes the selection of an aligned text imperative.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administrators will recruit Math teachers willing to serve on district committee.
2. Teachers will participate in school-level book selection process.

Person Responsible Melissa Abela (melissa.abela@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We will continue to use the Suite 360 Mental Health modules, in addition to small group and individual counseling to meet mental health needs at the school.

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.

Pine View School provides Parent and Family Engagement materials and trainings designed to provide assistance to parents and families in understanding challenging State academic standards, State and local academic assessments, how to monitor a child’s progress, and how to work with educators to improve the achievement of their children at convenient, flexible times such as mornings and evenings as well as at-home/attendance zone visits to fulfill the school’s mission and support the needs of students. Additionally, technology including social media and virtual meeting programs (Zoom, Teams, etc.) promote participation and awareness through live and recorded sessions to accommodate varying schedules. In addition, the district and school website contain links, resources, and materials, such as parent guides, study guides, practice assessments, student performance materials, and training to help parents and families work with their children to improve achievement.

The full text and summary of this Schoolwide Improvement Plan may be found online or as a hard copy by request. Parents and families are regularly invited to attend Pine View School Advisory Council meeting to formulate suggestions and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions relating to the education of their children. Pine View School responds to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible as evidenced by meeting minutes and notes. If this schoolwide improvement plan is not satisfactory to parents, parents/families are encouraged to submit such comments in writing so that the school can document and submit any parents’ comments.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Climate Committee- comprised of teachers, support staff and administration, monitor climate surveys and devise a schedule of events targeting positive climate.

Teachers 6-12- Facilitate monthly SEL lessons with students through Suite 360 Mental Health modules.

High School AO, Lana Marcotte works with a team of teachers and the Embracing Our Differences coalition to organize Unity Day events.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		310-Professional and Technical Services	0021 - Pine View School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Socratic Seminar Consultant fee for Socratic observations and non-evaluative feedback.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00

	Total: \$3,000.00
--	---------------------------------