

Sarasota County Schools

Pine View School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pine View School

1 PYTHON PATH, Osprey, FL 34229

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/pineview

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Covert, Stephen	Principal	Oversees the operations of the school. Aligns curriculum, programs, resources and all decisions to the mission and vision of the school.
Marcotte, Lana	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal with curriculum duties
Abela, Melissa	Assistant Principal	MS Assistant Principal
Sprinkle, Roy	Assistant Principal	ES Assistant Principal

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The due date for the SIP timeline was moved up to August 1, which is prior to teacher return from summer. The administrative team met to review all data and create the initial goal areas. A data report and draft of goals was sent to Instructional Leaders for feedback. The School Advisory Council (SAC) will review the goals during the August/September meeting.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The Assistant Principal over curriculum meets weekly with the testing coordinator to review and report new progress monitoring data. Data is shared monthly with the SAC Committee members. In addition, the Principal and Admin team meets quarterly with the Chief of High Schools to review progress towards goals and make revisions to the goals, as needed.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	15%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	7	2	6	4	9	18	13	59	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	3	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	5	4	2	5	3	11	12	122	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	5	4	2	5	3	11	12	42	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	98	65	53	99	69	55	99		
ELA Learning Gains				81			81		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				83			88		
Math Achievement*	100	68	55	100	37	42	100		
Math Learning Gains				91			85		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				93			84		
Science Achievement*	100	68	52	99	69	54	97		
Social Studies Achievement*	100	81	68	100	66	59	100		
Middle School Acceleration	100	77	70	100	45	51	98		
Graduation Rate	100	91	74	100	63	50	100		
College and Career Acceleration	100	62	53	99	82	70	99		
ELP Progress		43	55		79	70			

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	100
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	798
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	95
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	1045
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	100			
ELL	100			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	100			
HSP	100			
MUL	100			
PAC				
WHT	100			
FRL	100			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	99			
ELL	95			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	90			
HSP	94			
MUL	95			
PAC				
WHT	95			
FRL	96			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	98			100			100	100	100	100	100	
SWD	100			100			100				3	
ELL	98			100			100	100	100		5	
AMI												
ASN	99			100			100	100	100	100	8	
BLK	100			100							2	
HSP	98			100			100	100		100	6	
MUL	98			100			100	100	100	100	8	
PAC												
WHT	98			100			100	100	100	99	8	
FRL	97			100			100	100	100	100	8	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	99	81	83	100	91	93	99	100	100	100	99	
SWD	100	96		100	100							
ELL	100	90	91	100	93							
AMI												
ASN	100	85	82	100	95	94	100	100	100	100	97	
BLK	100	75		100	86							
HSP	100	83	80	100	87	96	97		100	100	100	
MUL	100	85	86	100	88	89	97	100	100	100	100	
PAC												
WHT	99	79	83	100	90	93	99	99	99	100	99	
FRL	100	81	88	100	90	96	100	100	100	100	100	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	99	81	88	100	85	84	97	100	98	100	99	
SWD	100	74		100	71							
ELL	100	87	82	100	71							
AMI												
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	
MUL	100	84	100	99	82	67	100	100				
PAC												
WHT	99	79	88	100	85	84	98	100	99	100	99	
FRL	99	82	87	100	83	85	98	100	100	100	94	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	98%	58%	40%	50%	48%
05	2023 - Spring	98%	67%	31%	54%	44%
07	2023 - Spring	98%	55%	43%	47%	51%
08	2023 - Spring	99%	55%	44%	47%	52%
09	2023 - Spring	98%	59%	39%	48%	50%
04	2023 - Spring	100%	67%	33%	58%	42%
06	2023 - Spring	96%	54%	42%	47%	49%
03	2023 - Spring	100%	61%	39%	50%	50%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	61%	39%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	100%	70%	30%	59%	41%
04	2023 - Spring	100%	70%	30%	61%	39%
08	2023 - Spring	100%	54%	46%	55%	45%
05	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	55%	45%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	99%	55%	44%	44%	55%
05	2023 - Spring	100%	67%	33%	51%	49%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	65%	35%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	59%	41%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	71%	29%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	79%	21%	66%	34%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	72%	28%	63%	37%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

In the FAST and EOC subject areas, no category has lower than a 96% mastery level in the tested subjects. The lowest performance is in 6th grade ELA, with a 96%.

There is an increase in the number of students with a Level 1 or 2, (Level 1-one student in grade 7 and one in grade 10. Level2- two in 5th, 3 in 6th, 2 in 7th, 1 in 8th,- and 2 in 9th). This may be due to scaling that has not yet been completed for the FAST assessment.

Learning Gains could be improved, with 81% overall and 83% for First Quartile students.

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

No areas had a decline. In fact, many of the AP courses showed large increases.

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.

No courses have gaps with the state for FAST and EOC testing. All AP courses score well above State and Global averages.

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

All math scores were proficient or above in grades 3-12.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Some grade levels experience attendance concerns, mostly due to college visits.

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

1. Use of the PLC model and Data analysis to increase teacher focus on student learning gains on FAST, EOCs, and AP courses.
2. Monitoring the teacher implementation of interventions to serve the increased number of L1 and 2 students.
3. Increased fidelity to middle school College and Career modules.
4. Continuation of community engagement efforts with a diverse and widespread community.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase student use of SchoolLinks and Naviance to provide optimal guidance for future goals, pathways, a streamlined approach to college applications, and increased success in postsecondary education.

Measurable Outcome:

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

1. Middle School student access to SchoolLinks and completion of modules exploring careers and pathways.

2. Improvement of student behavior and overall college outcomes for students in grades 9-12 as measured by:

Realistic targeting of post-secondary options (a reduction in overall applications, increased acceptances and

matriculation at target schools-year to year)

10% Reduction in overall applications

10% Increased Acceptance and Matriculation to Target Schools year-to-year

Application, acceptance, and matriculation to a wider variety of colleges/universities (data comparison)

Student usage of counseling website and Naviance

30% increase in usage of PVS counseling website and Naviance

3. The number of students earning a Capstone Diploma will continue to increase:

2019- 3; 2022- 30; 2023- 11.

4. Maintain a 100% acceleration rate in grades 9 through 12.

Monitoring:

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

The Assistant Principal focused on curriculum will oversee monitoring and supervise those working directly towards this goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

"A What Works Clearinghouse guide reported strong evidence that programs and curricula connecting school to college and career pathways lead to improved attendance, higher course pass rates, and a sense of belonging in school (Rumberger et al., 2017). Work-based learning experiences can offer students a means to explore career possibilities and help engage them in seeing the connection between work and the classroom (Alfeld et al., 2013; Bempechat et al., 2014; Kenny et al., 2010; Taylor et al., 2015)."

<https://tinyurl.com/4zpd3a3k>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy is aligned with district and state goals, as well as the mission and vision of our school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Meet bi-weekly with the MS CCLR coordinator to review curriculum and reports of student progress.

Person Responsible: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: bi-weekly throughout the school year

2. The APC will meet monthly with the HS CCLR faculty to review goals, data and needs.

Person Responsible: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly throughout the school year

3. The APC will work closely with AP Research and Seminar teachers to review student project topics, IRBs, and set up/advertise the annual Colloquium.

Person Responsible: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Throughout SY

4. The HS AP will meet monthly with the School Counselors to ensure 100% acceleration rate for HS.

Person Responsible: Eileen Cabrera (eileen.cabrera@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly during Collaborative Team meetings

Monitor each student who has taken or is registered for AP Seminar and AP Research to see if their graduation plan includes 4 AP courses.

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

By When: August 31. 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Pine View will continue to prioritize community engagement through various activities honoring individuals in our community, and bringing local resources into the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

1. Veteran's Day breakfast and assembly
2. Voter Registration
3. College and Career Fair
4. Holocaust Education partnership with Jewish Federation

Monitoring:

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

The AP focused on curriculum will coordinate/delegate and supervise the organization of the events above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

"Research shows that students learn better when their families and local community organizations are engaged in schools. Strong family engagement is linked to increased student achievement, reduced absenteeism, and higher graduation rates. In addition, community engagement can help ensure that students' social, emotional, and physical health needs are addressed, while also providing meaningful, real-world learning opportunities. Schools that engage with their communities are also better able to help students solve local problems, contribute to civic life, and respond to a changing economy." (<https://tinyurl.com/bdfvcfdd>)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Pine View serves grades 2 through 12 and draws students from across a 556 square mile county. Many families also report moving to the area specifically to attend the school. Engaging with the community brings students together and shines light on the many resources available. Additionally, this goal is directly related to the school's mission, which emphasizes social responsibility.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Organize Veteran's Day Assembly and Breakfast celebration.

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

By When: November 2023.

Facilitate Voter's Registration for Juniors and Seniors.

Person Responsible: Robin Melton (robin.melton@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Fall 2023

Organize College and Career Fairs for 8th grade and HS students.

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

By When: May 2024

Facilitate events provided by Jewish Federation for required education on Holocaust.

Person Responsible: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Although Pine View's data is overwhelmingly positive, there is an increase in the number of students scoring Level 1 or 2.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All Level 1 and 2 students will test at Level 3 by the 2nd assessment period.

Monitoring:

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

A team will meet to set up interventions and the Assistant Principal focused on curriculum will monitor progress throughout the year with the assistance of the testing coordinator.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

MTSS that is implemented with fidelity can yield an effect size of 1.29.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers who work with such high achieving students may need support designing, implementing, documenting and reporting throughout the intervention process.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

A meeting will be set for the teachers of all 12 students, the AP focused on curriculum, and School Counselors via Zoom to discuss requirements for interventions, the goal, the timeline, and when the progress meetings will take place.

Person Responsible: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 18, 2023

School Counselors will set meetings with their own grade level teachers and AP to design the intervention and documentation system.

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

By When: August 25, 2023

Assistant Principal focused on curriculum and testing coordinator will use the testing calendar to set dates to check on these 12 students, specifically and report findings to Counselors and grade-level APs, as well as teachers.

Person Responsible: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: December 2023 through February 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Through strategic use of the Collaborative Team model:

1. We will increase the percentage of learning gains for ELA students overall, and students in our ELA First Quartile. This decision was based on selecting subgroups that achieved lower than 85% proficiency in ELA .

Learning Gain- 81% overall, Black 75%, Asian 82%, White 83%

Learning Gains First Quartile- 83% overall, Hispanic 80%, Asian 82%, White 83%.

2. We will increase the number of 4s and 5s earned in the following AP subjects by a minimum of 5%age points. Although we score well above state and global averages in all of these subjects, and many of these subjects made great gains over the last two years in number of Level 3-5, we continue to push ourselves to excel.

Measurable Outcome:

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

1. All students will make gains as evidenced by classroom data and FAST Progress monitoring. from AP 1 to AP 2.

2. Increase of 5% for each of the following AP courses:

Art History- 78% to 83%

Bio- 68% to 73%

Calc BC- 53% to 58%

CSA- 76% to 81%

CSP 64% to 69%

Lang- 73% to 78%

Env Sci- 56% to 61%

Euro- 50% to 55%

Macro- 53% to 58%

Micro 76% to 81%

Music Thry- 50% to 55%

Phys I- 68% to 73%

Phys 2- 50% to 55%

Phys CEM- 75% to 80%

Psych 69% to 74%

Research 47% to 52%

Seminar- 61% to 66%

Span Lang- 75% to 80%

Statistics- 50% to 55%

St Art Draw- 50% to 55%

US Gov/Pol- 41% to 46%

USH- 62% to 67%

Monitoring:

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

1. The APs at each grade level will attend Collaborative Team meetings to help newly trained facilitators to keep groups focused on the 4 questions and data from common classroom assessments and formal

progress monitoring platforms.

2. The Assistant Principal focused on curriculum will meet with the AP Coordinator to track AP data collected from teachers using AP Classroom and classroom data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implementation of and fidelity to a Collaborative Team process based on "Learning By Doing" book study.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collective Teacher Efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. With an effect size of $d=1.57$

"According to Hattie's presentation at the Collaborative Impact Conference 2017 "Collective Teacher Efficacy" is not about making teachers feel good about themselves. It is more complicated than just believing you can make a difference collectively. One of the authors that come closest to Hattie's definition "collaborative conversation based on evidence" is Jenni Donohoo with her book "Collective Efficacy: How Educators' Beliefs Impact Student Learning". (<https://tinyurl.com/bdcwnr2z>)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Facilitator training schoolwide

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

By When: August 8, 2023

Change the Collaborative Team structure at PV from content and grade level to a content area focus.

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

By When: August 8, 2023

Alter the AP Teacher meeting focus to include data share from AP Classroom and other classroom data.

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

By When: First meeting by 8-31-23, and monthly, thereafter.

APs attend and monitor CTs weekly and assist facilitators.

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

By When: Attending each PLC will be the priority the first month of school and, as teams become more practiced in the new system, APs can reduce their attendance.

Assistant Principals of each grade level will bring data artifacts from their CT attendance to their AP Collaborative Team meetings for collective review.

Person Responsible: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Monthly Guiding Coalition meetings with artifact sharing by Instructional Leaders each month.

Person Responsible: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Quarterly training of Guiding Coalition members on Professional Days.

Person Responsible: Lana Marcotte (lana.marcotte@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

Fidelity Check to share progress with Chief of High Schools.

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

By When: Quarterly

Drill down into FAST data to show specific indicators of concern and share with subject area teachers.

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

By When: 8/3/23

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**