Pineapple Cove Classical Academy

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy

6162 MINTON RD NW, Palm Bay, FL 32907

http://www.pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Wheeler

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2018-19 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 (63%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy

6162 MINTON RD NW, Palm Bay, FL 32907

http://www.pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	26%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	33%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	C

School Board Approval

N/A

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 Pineapple Cove Classical Academy is to develop graduates in mind and character through a classical, content-rich curriculum that emphasizes the principles of virtuous living, traditional learning, and civic responsibility. We are building intelligent, virtuous American citizens.

Last revision date 8/2015

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy is affiliated with Hillsdale College's Barney Charter School initiative. We will offer a unique option for families providing students with a K-10 option for classical education on one campus. Students will receive a cohesive Classical education, which builds upon itself year after year, creating a successful foundation for learning. Students will be intentionally taught the benefits of a virtuous character and will be challenged through the lessons taught within the curriculum to develop and strengthen their character. Our teachers will provide the support and attention students require in order to meet the high expectations of a Classical education. The strong leadership of our Board, Administration, and Teachers will provide an excellent example of character for our students.

Last revision date 8/12/19 (grade level)

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wheeler, Lisa	Principal	The School Leadership Team is responsible for the overall guidance and leadership of the school. The team oversees the implementation of curriculum, school-wide discipline, and community relations. The leadership team supports teachers and staff, analyzes data to determine student needs, and serves on the school attendance committee. In addition to the duties listed above, the principal is also responsible for the hiring and evaluation of teachers and staff, ensuring school safety and security, including the Threat Assessment Team, the maintenance and upkeep of the school grounds and facilities, reporting and communicating with the school's governing board and Hillsdale College, maintaining compliance with district and authorizer requirements, evaluating professional development needs for the school, and implementing necessary training.
Ottinger, John	Assistant Principal	In addition to the job duties listed above, Mr. Ottinger is the testing coordinator for grades 7-10. In addition, he assists with teacher and staff evaluations, serves as a contact/organizer of our extracurricular activities, and designs school-wide and student schedules.
Kraus, Miranda	Administrative Support	In addition to the responsibilities of the School Leadership Team, Ms. Blain serves as an interventionist for struggling students, if needed. She also coaches new teachers in the policies and procedures of our school. This includes day to day operations, as well as instructional practices.
Engeron, Tara	Assistant Principal	In addition to the job duties listed above, Ms. Engeron is the testing coordinator for grades K-6. In addition, she supports teacher and staff evaluations, serves as a contact/organizer of our extracurricular activities, and designs school-wide and student schedules.
Johns, Michelle	Administrative Support	In addition to the responsibilities of the School Leadership Team, Mrs. Johns serves as our ESOL contact and interventionist for struggling students, if needed. She also coaches new teachers in the policies and procedures of our school. This includes day to day operations, as well as instructional practices.
Gunter, Kelly	Other	Mrs. Gunter is our Director of Schools. In addition to duties listed above, Mrs. Gunter manages the school budget, advises on financial matters, guides teachers and ensures compliance with certification, manages Charter Tools to ensure compliance with Office of EIC.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	73	71	72	86	88	88	106	104	56	41	0	0	857
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	4	2	2	3	7	8	3	6	3	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	0	2	1	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	7	4	5	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	8	4	21	17	4	8	0	0	70

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	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	11

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	3	7	4	5	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
59

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/18/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	65%	61%	75%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	58%	59%	60%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	54%	54%	39%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	77%	67%	62%	70%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	69%	62%	59%	79%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	59%	52%	65%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	68%	62%	56%	61%	62%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	80%	78%	86%	82%	75%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey													
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**													**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72 (0)	73 (0)	71 (0)	72 (0)	86 (0)	88 (0)	88 (0)	106 (0)	104 (0)	56 (0)	41 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	857 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 ()	3 ()	4 ()	2 ()	2 ()	3 ()	7 ()	8 ()	3 ()	6 ()	3 ()	0 ()	0 ()	44 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	5 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	19 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 ()	7 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	27 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)	8 (0)	4 (0)	21 (0)	17 (0)	4 (0)	8 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	70 (0)

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	80%	64%	16%	58%	22%
	2018	77%	63%	14%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	61%	7%	58%	10%
	2018	77%	57%	20%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
	2018	66%	54%	12%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	53%	60%	-7%	54%	-1%
	2018	73%	63%	10%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2019	65%	58%	7%	52%	13%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	60%	63%	-3%	56%	4%
	2018	80%	65%	15%	58%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
09	2019	62%	62%	0%	55%	7%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	61%	7%	62%	6%
	2018	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
	2018	84%	59%	25%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	97%	60%	37%	60%	37%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
06	2019	67%	67%	0%	55%	12%
	2018	77%	68%	9%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
07	2019	90%	62%	28%	54%	36%
	2018	78%	62%	16%	54%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	74%	43%	31%	46%	28%
	2018	54%	41%	13%	45%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	68%	56%	12%	53%	15%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	62%	53%	9%	48%	14%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	50%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	66%	11%	67%	10%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	74%	6%	71%	9%
2018	86%	73%	13%	71%	15%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	61%	22%	61%	22%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		-12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	50	45	47	46	33	30				
ELL	43	44	30	57	67						
BLK	64	42		89	88		69				
HSP	61	50	37	67	61	67	71				
MUL	81	48		78	70						
WHT	69	56	45	78	70	63	66	82	35		
FRL	61	46	32	68	67	64	67		43		
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	38	46	53	44	50	50	33				
BLK	85	63		64	72						
HSP	67	57	43	68	76	75	59	92			
MUL	79	54		74	42						
WHT	73	58	51	71	74	71	66	81	45		
FRL	72	60	60	63	68	80	60	88			

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	34	32	26	45	54	38					
BLK	67	67		60	67						
HSP	70	54	27	63	76	75					
MUL	92	60		83	90						
WHT	76	62	44	71	79	63	64	85			
FRL	72	59	47	64	77	56	50	100			

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
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	59
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	69
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	63
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Last year, our ELA scores for the lowest 25 percentile were the lowest in our data profile. This group's data dropped eight percentage points from the year before. We believe there are a few contributing factors- our fourth grade had a high percentage of ESE students that moved up from third grade. This, coupled with addition of writing to FSA posed some challenges. In addition, we had an influx of new to PCCA scholars in grades 7-9. Also, our sixth graders received ELA instruction in a middle school period that was the same length as other periods.

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

Last year, our 6th grade ELA scores showed the greatest decline. We can attribute this to couple of reasons. Sixth graders received ELA instruction in a middle school schedule, with 50 minute periods. In another setting, they would have still received 90 minutes of ELA instruction daily. This change in time could impacted their performance. In addition, this group was taught by teacher that had many years of teaching experience, but this was her first year teaching at PCCA. Moving to a new curriculum and instructional method involves an adjustment period for any teacher.

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.

Last year, we only had one data point that was below the state average. Sixth grade scholars performed 1% less than the state. The factors impacting this are described above.

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

Last year, our fourth grade math scores showed the greatest improvement for the cohort. These scholars performed very poorly as a third grade group, with only 49% scoring proficiently. We recognized this need, and worked to provide extensive support to our fourth grade math classes. These classes are already grouped by ability, so our Guidance Counselor pushed into our lowest math class, providing daily support. In addition, we conducted diagnostic fluency probes to determine needs for computation practice. These probes determined that scholars needed additional Tier 2 support in addition and subtraction with multiple digits. Once this was practiced, we moved on to division.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Our biggest area of concern is the amount of students in seventh and eighth grade scoring a Level 1 on the Reading or Math FSA. When analyzing the data further, it can be seen that 62% of seventh graders and 53% of eighth graders are new to PCCA for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

1. Improvement of ELA performance to include Lowest 25%, Learning Gains, and Overall Achievement
2. Reducing number of level 1 students on state assessments
3.

4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English Language Arts
Rationale	We attribute the decrease in scores for our Lowest 25%, Learning Gains, and Overall ELA performance to some changes in our middle and high school last year. Our sixth grade scholars rotated classes and had an ELA class that was the same length as our other subjects. We had some substantial changes to our population in grades 7-9. Adjusting to a new school, with a more rigorous curriculum and literature selection, proved to be a challenge for some our scholars.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, 55% of our scholars in grades 3-9 will show improvements in learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Effective Tier 1 and 2 instruction are vital in a successful school setting. Teachers must provide explicit, direct instruction during Tier 1 and provide remediation as necessary in a smaller, Tier 2 setting. In Tier 1 instruction, we hope that scholars are having a variety of experiences with the rich literature they read. The ELA block should include times of read aloud, silent reading, and text analysis. Homework should be a review of what is read in class or a preview of what will be read and discussed the following day. Tier 2 instruction will not involve a different methodology, but rather more time on a given subject, topic, or task so that the student has the ability to catch up to his or her peers. When these methods are not successful, the scholar should be referred to the Individual Problem Solving Team for additional support.

Action Step	
Description	1. Literacy Coach- Our management company, Classical Education Management, provided a Literacy Coach to work with new teachers last year. This year, the coach will work with new and veteran teachers, supporting them with instruction and intervention for our lowest performing scholars. 2. Professional Development- Our teachers will participate in professional development provided by Hillsdale College in the summer. This training provides experiences for teachers to engage in discussion and modeled lessons with Hillsdale staff and teachers from around the country. In addition, the College will visit our campus on two occasions this year. During these visits, the team observes in classrooms and provides valuable feedback. 3. Learning Strategies- We have implemented a Learning Strategies class to support our ESE students in middle and high school grades. Our ESE teacher is providing organizational and instructional support for our neediest students. 4. Enhanced use of Thinkwave to support scholars and parents- Because we have so many new families in our school this year, we will provide additional training and explanation about Thinkwave to our scholars and families. This online tool allows all stakeholders to take ownership of classroom performance through the online gradebook

and announcement section. Scholars can receive timely feedback and learn of assignment due dates and test/quiz dates.

Person Responsible   Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

#2	
Title	Level 1 Scores
Rationale	In reviewing school data, we discovered that many students in seventh and eighth grade scored a Level 1 on their Reading or Math FSA. Further analysis shows that many of these scholars are new to our school this year. We will need to work closely to monitor their progress. In seventh grade, 33% of those scoring a Level 1 earned this score in both subjects, 10% earned a Level 1 in ELA, and 57% earned a Level 1 in Math. In eighth grade, 12% of those scoring a Level 1 earned this score in both subjects, 53% earned a Level 1 in ELA, and 35% earned a Level 1 in Math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May of 2020, 90% of our seventh and eighth grade students will earn a score of 2 or above on FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using Student Achievement Data To Support Instructional Decision Making
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The data shows that 63% of the students in this category did not attend PCCA last year. We believe that these low performing students may not have been properly identified at their previous schools, therefore intervention, mentoring, and communication may not have been effective. We hope that enrollment in a smaller school with better opportunities for better relationships with teachers and staff members will improve performance on standardized assessments. We will make sure our teachers and staff work closely to ensure a supportive environment for these scholars and their families.

Action Step	
Description	1. MTSS/IPST process- We will work to identify students in need and develop intervention as needed. The past and current performance of these students will be discussed by our Individual Problem Solving Team. These meetings will include parent communication about student progress and ways for parents to become involved in intervention and after school tutoring.
	2. Intervention groups- Intervention will occur in a variety of ways. We have set up enrichment classes for all of our seventh graders to enhance abilities in composition and math. This class is connecting literature read during ELA and writing activities, furthering comprehension ability. In math, seventh graders are participating in standards based math instruction. Our math coach is working closely with this teacher to analyze data and make instructional decisions. For our seventh and eighth graders that have IEPs, we have implemented a learning strategies class to support their needs.
	3. Mentoring of new students- Transitioning to a new school with different expectations for both behavior and academics can be challenging. We will be sure to communicate the academic needs of new students to PCCA with all teachers and staff so that everyone is working together to support their needs.
	4. Professional Development- We have many new teachers in our Junior/Senior High School. Many are new to data analysis and use of Performance Matters. We will train teachers in the proper and efficient ways to analyze data and make instructional decisions

based on this information. In addition, we will train teachers on the MTSS/IPST process so that everyone feels comfortable and confident in making referrals to the team. Our Literacy and Math coach will also work to support teachers with intervention support as we work to provide additional services.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

In addition these academic goals, we are working diligently to improve the safety and security of our scholars and school. Completion of our FSSAT showed the following needs: additional signage for the interior and exterior of the building, proper training of our Threat Assessment Team, additional lighting for our track and field, minor repairs and enhancements to gates, and enhanced staff knowledge of procedures. Throughout the year, we will embed training and reflection on critical incident drills to our monthly faculty and staff meetings so that everyone is aware of ways that our procedures can improve. Our Threat Assessment Team will work closely with all staff members to develop relationships with all scholars and staff members to improve communication of threats and other information on behalf of all stakeholders. Everyone in our building (parents, scholars, teachers, staff, administration) needs to work together and have ownership of the policies and procedures necessary to keep everyone safe.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

n/a

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

n/a

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

n/a

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

n/a

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts				$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			6543 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy			$0.00
			Notes: Literacy Coach provided by Classical Education Management			
			6543 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy			$10,000.00
			Notes: Professional Development at Hillsdale College			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Level 1 Scores				$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			6543 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy			$10,000.00
			Notes: Professional Development at Hillsdale College during the summer			
			6543 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy			$0.00
			Notes: Literacy and Math Coaches provided by Classical Education Management			
					Total:	$20,000.00