

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Pinecrest Preparatory Academy Charter High



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Pinecrest Preparatory Academy Charter High School

14901 SW 42ND ST, Miami, FL 33185

www.ppmcharterschool.org

## Demographics

Principal: Amelia Estrada

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (67%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

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

## School Board Approval

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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

# Pinecrest Preparatory Academy Charter High School

14901 SW 42ND ST, Miami, FL 33185

www.ppmcharterschool.org

## 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)
High School 9-12	No	60%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	95%

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Perpetuate a school community that cultivates emotional, moral and  
Physical well-being while  
Motivating and preparing students to achieve  
High standards in order to become effective leaders

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

At Pinecrest Preparatory Middle-High (PPMH), we will strive to perpetuate a community of learners in which the pursuit of Honor, High Standards, and Intellectual Growth is complemented by a concern for the physical, cultural and character development of each student. Through its academic rigor, PPMH promotes a sense of identity, community, personal integrity and values that prepare students to become effective leaders.

### 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
Nunez, Maria	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget / Financials</li> <li>• Curriculum &amp; Instruction</li> <li>• Personnel</li> <li>• Teacher Mentor Program</li> <li>• School Operations</li> </ul>
Ulloa, Kismet	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academy of Science &amp; Technology</li> <li>• Academy of Business &amp; Finance</li> <li>• Mathematics Department</li> <li>• Science Department</li> <li>• School-wide Technology Initiatives</li> <li>• STEM Liaison</li> <li>• Student Assessment</li> <li>• Lunch Program</li> <li>• Marketing and Recruitment</li> <li>• School Safety and Threat Assessment Team</li> <li>• School Security</li> <li>• TEAMS After School Program</li> <li>• Educational School Advisory Council (EESAC)</li> <li>• Parents as Liaisons (PALs)</li> <li>• Health Services</li> <li>• Faculty Meetings</li> <li>• PSAT Coordinator</li> <li>• Arrival / Dismissal</li> </ul>
Estrada, Amelia	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early College Academy – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Advanced Placement and PreAP Program</li> <li>o Dual Enrollment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• English Language Arts Department</li> <li>• Social Studies Department</li> <li>• Electives Department</li> <li>• PreAP and AP Coordinator</li> <li>• AP Capstone</li> <li>• Master Schedule</li> <li>• Student Services and College Advisement Program</li> <li>• Special Education</li> <li>• English Language Learners</li> <li>• Attendance</li> <li>• Multi-Tiered Student Support System (MTSS/RtI)</li> <li>• Professional Development</li> <li>• Curriculum Council</li> <li>• Retention Prevention</li> <li>• Summer School</li> <li>• Mental Health</li> <li>• Arrival / Dismissal</li> </ul>
Llambes, Greide	Administrative Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall leadership, supervision, and coordination of all activities programs</li> </ul>



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional Support</li> <li>• Gradebook Manager</li> <li>• Middle School EESAC Chair</li> <li>• Parents as Liaisons (PALs)</li> <li>• Social Media</li> <li>• Arrival / Dismissal</li> </ul>

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	113	122	104	459
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	10	0	26

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	12	0	15	16	43

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/28/2019

### 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	72%	59%	56%	71%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	54%	51%	61%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	48%	42%	49%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	55%	54%	51%	45%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	44%	52%	48%	36%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	51%	45%	26%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	63%	68%	68%	74%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	76%	73%	87%	71%	70%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	120 (0)	113 (0)	122 (0)	104 (0)	459 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	12 (0)	18 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	10 (0)	6 (0)	10 (0)	0 (0)	26 (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
09	2019	74%	55%	19%	55%	19%
	2018	63%	54%	9%	53%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	69%	53%	16%	53%	16%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	53%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	63%	68%	-5%	67%	-4%
2018	60%	65%	-5%	65%	-5%
Compare		3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	71%	12%	70%	13%
2018	86%	67%	19%	68%	18%
Compare		-3%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	63%	5%	61%	7%
2018	51%	59%	-8%	62%	-11%
Compare		17%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	54%	-6%	57%	-9%
2018	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Compare		-6%			

## 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	53	53		27	13						
ELL	65	61	48	53	35	17	45	50			
HSP	72	56	43	55	45	32	64	84		99	99
WHT	90	60									
FRL	68	53	35	48	42	29	60	82		98	98
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	53	59		41	53						
ELL	22	59	62	35	55	67	38	82		79	73
HSP	67	62	65	54	50	53	62	85		95	68
WHT								100			
FRL	65	63	64	54	47	45	67	92		93	69

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	50	80		67	58						
ELL	39	47	45	31	24	18	80				
HSP	71	62	49	46	36	27	75	87		96	44
WHT	65	60		41	32		70				
FRL	71	59	50	45	35	25	78	87		96	46

### 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	65
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	713
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	49
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	75
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	62
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.**

The lowest performing subgroup as identified by the 2019 School Grade Components by Subgroups data disaggregation tool is the SWD. In terms of their math achievement, the SWD subgroup demonstrated a 27% 2019 math achievement score (compared to 41% in 2018) and 13% math learning gains (compared to 53% in 2018). These students have continued to struggle with geometry standards and have not optimized the remediation opportunities given.

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

As stated above, the math achievement and learning gains demonstrate that greatest decline for the SWD subgroup.

**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.**

The greatest gap when compared to the state average is demonstrated by the Math lower quartile group. The trend identified is that these students have exhibited gaps in math standards, and at our school, take Algebra I in the high school (while the majority of students have taken this course as part of acceleration curriculum in our feeder school). As a result, students that enroll in the geometry course as sophomores are hindered by their knowledge of geometry, and did not receive adequate supplemental support.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA achievement. This year, all English I students were exposed to the College Board, research-based, Pre-Advanced Placement curriculum.

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

As identified in the EWS data, the areas of potential concern is the students not fulfilling the Algebra I EOC graduation requirement, as well as the number of students still earning a level 1 or 2 on the FSA Reading Assessment.

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

1. SWD- math learning gains and achievement
2. Students not fulfilling the Algebra I EOC graduation requirement
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Math Learning Gains and Achievement - SWD
<b>Rationale</b>	As identified by the 2019 School Grade Components by Subgroups data disaggregation tool, the lowest performing subgroup is the SWD. In terms of their math achievement, the SWD subgroup demonstrated a 27% 2019 math achievement score (compared to 41% in 2018) and 13% math learning gains (compared to 53% in 2018). These students have continued to struggle with statistics and have not optimized remediation opportunities given.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Utilizing the 2019-2020 Algebra I EOC, it is expected that 50% of our SWD population will make one year worth of learning gains.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Greide Llambes (gllambes@ppmhcharterschool.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	In addition to the intensive mathematics course that is offered to all Level 1 and 2 students, SWD will be offered mandatory pull-out tutoring in small group settings.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	As per attendance logs, this subgroup has shown lack of attendance for after-school or Saturday tutoring.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use a certified interventionist to provide pull-out tutoring during FOCUS period.</li> <li>2. Student Services will inform parents of the tutoring and continue to monitor academic progress.</li> <li>3. Respective math teacher will collaborate with interventionist to design prescriptive lessons based on results from formative and summative assessments.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Greide Llambes (gllambes@ppmhcharterschool.org)

### 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 order to address students not earning a passing score on the Algebra I EOC, teachers will continue implementing the PreAP curriculum in Algebra I. Morning and after school tutoring will be offered to students not exhibiting adequate growth in formative and summative assessments (topic tests, mid-year assessments, and classroom based assessments).