

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Pinecrest Academy Charter Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pinecrest Academy Charter Middle School

14901 SW 42ND ST, Miami, FL 33185

<http://pinecrestpreparatoryacademy.dadeschools.net>

Demographics

Principal: Amelia Estrada

Start Date for this Principal: 9/5/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	60%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: I (%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: A (71%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pinecrest Academy Charter Middle School

14901 SW 42ND ST, Miami, FL 33185

<http://pinecrestpreparatoryacademy.dadeschools.net>

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

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

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

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

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	160	154	214	0	0	0	0	528	
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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	12	17	0	0	0	0	52	

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	25	23	18	0	0	0	0	66

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	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	
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

Thursday 9/5/2019

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	78%	58%	54%	0%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	58%	54%	0%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	52%	47%	0%	48%	44%
Math Achievement	78%	58%	58%	0%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	62%	56%	57%	0%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	54%	51%	0%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	69%	52%	51%	0%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	91%	74%	72%	0%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	160 (0)	154 (0)	214 (0)	528 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	23 (0)	12 (0)	17 (0)	52 (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
06	2019	73%	58%	15%	54%	19%
	2018	72%	53%	19%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	80%	56%	24%	52%	28%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	76%	60%	16%	56%	20%
	2018	75%	59%	16%	58%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	68%	58%	10%	55%	13%
	2018	77%	56%	21%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	71%	53%	18%	54%	17%
	2018	65%	52%	13%	54%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	75%	40%	35%	46%	29%
	2018	72%	38%	34%	45%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	57%	43%	14%	48%	9%
	2018	42%	44%	-2%	50%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	68%	28%	67%	29%
2018	95%	65%	30%	65%	30%
Compare		1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	73%	17%	71%	19%
2018	84%	72%	12%	71%	13%
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	97%	63%	34%	61%	36%
2018	99%	59%	40%	62%	37%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	54%	39%	57%	36%
2018	96%	54%	42%	56%	40%
Compare		-3%			

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	32	33	30	47	58						
ELL	60	63	65	67	53	64	36	76	79		
HSP	77	65	65	78	63	72	69	91	89		
WHT	91	73		73	36						
FRL	79	67	64	77	62	71	65	90	89		
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	33	47		53	73						
ELL	37	49	57	59	60	62	33	65			
HSP	72	63	56	79	68	69	66	84	91		
WHT	87	57		91	74		77		91		
FRL	72	61	60	79	68	69	65	82	93		
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	24	57	60	33	43	60					
ELL	32	53	56	44	45	58	18	72			
HSP	63	62	57	63	52	54	57	81	68		
WHT	80	83		65	67			100	73		
FRL	60	60	56	60	50	53	52	75	59		

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	75
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	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	745
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
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	64
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	75
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	68
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	75
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.

As identified by the 2019 School Grade Components by Subgroup data disaggregation tool, the lowest performing subgroup is the SWD. In terms of English Language Arts learning gains score, the SWD subgroup earned a 30% score (compared to 47% in 2018). In addition, the English Language Arts achievement score yields at a 32% (a one percentage point decrease from 2018). These students have continued to struggle with Integration of Knowledge and Ideas.

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

As stated above, the component that showed the greatest decline is the ELA learning gains score from 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.

All data components exceeded state averages.

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

Social Studies Achievement showed the most improvement among the data components. Instructional strategies included focus on Evidence-based reading and writing, incorporating the College Board Pre-AP principles applied to the Civics curriculum. Students that were under performing in the mid-year assessment and/or summative assessments were invited to target tutoring.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, an area of concern is the number of 6th grade students that earned a level 1 on state assessments.

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

1. Integration of Knowledge and Ideas - SWD
2. Number of 6th grade students earning a level 1 on state assessments.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Learning Gains - SWD subgroup
Rationale	As identified by the 2019 School Grade Components by Subgroup data disaggregation tool, the lowest performing subgroup is the SWD. In terms of English Language Arts learning gains score, the SWD subgroup earned a 30% score (compared to 47% in 2018). In addition, the English Language Arts achievement score yields at a 32% (a one percentage point decrease from 2018). These students have continued to struggle with Integration of Knowledge and Ideas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Utilizing the 2019-2020 FSA ELA assessment, it is expected that 50% of our SWD population will make one year worth of learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amelia Estrada (ameliaestrada@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	In addition to the intensive reading course that is offered to all Level 1 and 2 students, SWD will be offered mandatory tutoring in small group settings before and after school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Prescriptive targeted tutoring based on flexible grouping will provide additional assistance to subgroup. As a result, these tutoring sessions will be focused on content-specific material, as well as test taking skills. Emphasis is on remediation, ensuring students master concepts not attained during the regular school day.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certified tutors will design these lessons tailored to the flexible groups (based on data collected by I Ready assessments, SpringBoard ZINC reports, and results of classroom-based assessments). 2. Student Services will inform parents of the tutoring and continue to monitor academic progress. 3. Respective math teacher will collaborate with interventionist to design prescriptive lessons based on results from formative and summative assessments. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Amelia Estrada (ameliaestrada@dadeschools.net)

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 further support 6th grade students earning a level 1 on state assessments (ELA and/or mathematics), students will be required to attend the Saturday Success Academy program, which begins in January and ends in April. This program is offered for seven consecutive Saturdays for three hours per session and focus on test taking skills.