

Pasco County Schools

# Pine View Elementary School



## 2022-23 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>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</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>

## Demographics

**Principal: Jennifer Jaworski**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

<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>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
<b>2021-22 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>	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (52%)
<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>	TSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](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.

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

## Pine View Elementary School

5333 PARKWAY BLVD, Land O Lakes, FL 34639

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

### 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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jaworski, Jennifer		
Maus, Jessica	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Jennifer Jaworski

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

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

26

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

570

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

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

## Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	77	85	92	91	85	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	6	9	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA or Math	0	0	0	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	3	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Thursday 7/21/2022

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	79	88	90	81	109	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	11	6	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course Failure ELA or Math	0	0	3	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 Statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	1	4	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

**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	3	0	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	

**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	79	88	90	81	109	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	11	6	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course Failure ELA or Math	0	0	3	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 Statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

#### 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	1	4	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

#### 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	3	0	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	

## 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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	64%	52%	56%				62%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						54%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						55%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	63%	46%	50%				65%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						68%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						48%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	50%	59%				51%	53%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	59%	8%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	65%	59%	6%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	62%	7%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	24	37	36	25	41	26	14				
BLK	39			44							
HSP	60	51	33	62	59	38	52				
WHT	67	53	50	64	59	48	53				
FRL	50	45	46	50	51	45	47				
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	21	35	27	29	45	38	20				
ELL	50			50							
BLK	35			29							
HSP	59	38		56	44		44				
WHT	62	38	21	57	37	25	51				
FRL	48	41	42	40	34	31	38				
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				

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	51
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	
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	56
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### 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?

ELA and math achievement are on a slow decline but still about the 50% (ELA 60%, Math 54%).

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA and Math Lowest 25th percentile as well as ELA and Math learning gains.

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

Students coming back from the pandemic with gaps, and a stronger focus needed on learning gains and foundational skills.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA achievement for HSP and ELL subgroup data.

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

Strong Tier 1 instruction in ELA.

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

Create units of inquiry reflection questions that align IPG Core Action 3 to IB Standards and Practices

**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.**

Staff development for IPG Core Action 3 as well as “Inquiry Mindset” and “The Knowledge Gap” book study Revisit.

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

Develop IB units of inquiry that include conceptual understanding, inquiry cycles, and integration of B.E.S.T standards and ELA curriculum.

#### **Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Subgroup data for SWD in ELA was 21%, 29% in math, and 20% in science.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

ESE and basic teachers will collaborate weekly to plan instruction that includes the specific differentiated needs of ESE students. PLCs will disaggregate CFA/Module assessment data to look for trends and develop a systematic process for reteach (Tier 2) of the core. Implement SIPPS as a building-wide intervention for SWD and Tier 3. As well as, develop tiered interventions around knowledge building with a focus on science.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Weekly MTSS meetings and bi-weekly SIT meetings to monitor data and action plan.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Maus (jmaus@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

By the conclusion of the 2022-2023 school year, at least 40% of SWD, will be making learning gains as measured by State Testing.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

With the ESE teacher and classroom teacher working together to ensure students with disabilities are making learning gains, and receiving differentiated instruction based on their needs, we should see all SWD getting closer to closing their achievement gap.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PD with District MTSS Specialist on SF collaboration, staff development for IPG Core Action 3, and SIPPS Training-District provided. PLCs will develop and implement quality T3 action plans to support universal skill gaps as well as T2 action plans.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Jaworski (jjaworsk@pasco.k12.fl.us)



## **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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### **Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Create building-wide incentive program for students and staff, using surveys, interest inventories, and conferences. Creation of the IB Program of Inquiry. Aligning the PYP framework (standards & practices) to the B.E.S.T standards and the new ELA curriculum. Develop workgroups who will create activities/ideas, that will build collaboration between students, staff, parents, and the community. Staff will lead, model, and support a caring and compassionate school environment for ALL learners and families.

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

Spring/Summer workgroups and beginning of the year PD. SAC, PTO, SIT, Student council, and the Collaborative culture committee are all invested in ensuring a positive school culture and environment.