
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Pinecrest Preparatory Charter

8503 DAETWYLER DR, Orlando, FL 32827

www.pinecrestorlando.org

Demographics

Principal: Des IR Ee Lumpuy

Start Date for this Principal: 9/3/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2020-21 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Pinecrest Preparatory Charter

8503 DAETWYLER DR, Orlando, FL 32827

www.pinecrestorlando.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>76%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>80%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Providing individual instruction, in a nurturing environment, ensuring college and career success, using rigor, relevance, and relationships to empower students to become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower lifelong learners with the knowledge and values required for productive global leadership.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lumpuy, Desiree	Principal	
Christie, Samantha	Staffing Specialist	The leadership team conducts weekly/daily classroom visits to ensure teachers are teaching to the rigor of the Florida State Standards and monitoring student engagement. The leadership team also provides weekly/daily feedback to teachers in an effort to build instructional capacity. Pinecrest Preparatory has instituted the New Teacher Mentoring and Induction program for teachers with 0-3 years of experience. This program provides targeted Professional Development. The initial professional development focus includes school and district policies and procedures, the evaluation system, effective teaching strategies and practices, instructional rounds observing experienced teachers, assistance with effective lesson planning, as well as, emotional support throughout the school year.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/3/2021, Des IR Ee Lumpuy

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Total number of students enrolled at the school

270

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

0

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

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	35	37	25	31	41	25	23	26	27	0	0	0	0	270
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	0	1	2	2	4	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	4	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	3	2	7	7	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	38

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	3	0	3	3	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	20

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/3/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	36	28	29	34	20	22	26	27	13	0	0	0	0	235
Attendance below 90 percent	4	3	3	4	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	3	7	2	1	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	5	4	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	7

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	5	6	6	1	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	31

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - 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	
Number of students enrolled	36	28	29	34	20	22	26	27	13	0	0	0	0	235
Attendance below 90 percent	4	3	3	4	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	3	7	2	1	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	5	4	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	7

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	5	6	6	1	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	4	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				69%	62%	61%	61%	60%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	60%	59%	58%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	55%	54%	77%	54%	52%
Math Achievement				78%	61%	62%	79%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains				69%	60%	59%	81%	60%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	54%	52%	78%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				66%	56%	56%	62%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				87%	74%	78%	62%	74%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
06	2021					
	2019	60%	52%	8%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	69%	48%	21%	52%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	63%	9%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	86%	57%	29%	60%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
06	2021					
	2019	62%	43%	19%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
07	2021					
	2019	88%	49%	39%	54%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	36%	-36%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	68%	49%	19%	48%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	88%	66%	22%	71%	17%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	63%	37%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

We use iReady Diagnostics as our monitoring tool for Reading and Math. We use the district PMAs as a monitoring tool for Science, Civics, and Algebra.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33%	35%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21%	29%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37%	62%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34%	37%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54%	72%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1%	37%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47%	65%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36%	55%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45%	63%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36%	50%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33%	29%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40%	55%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44%	1%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	48%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37%	44%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46%	15%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	55%	53%
Science	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
All Students	54%	69%	71%	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	27			36							
ELL	56	64	85	60	76	80	61	60			
BLK	80			73							
HSP	69	73	87	67	75	79	68	76			
WHT	77	67		59	69						
FRL	70	71	87	65	72	78	70	72			
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
ELL	64	70	56	70	68	56	50				
BLK	77	80		85	60						
HSP	72	66	62	78	70	63	62	83			
WHT	57	56		71	70						

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
FRL	68	67	68	77	67	67	66	81	100		
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	15			38	50						
ELL	45	77	80	71	81	79		30			
BLK	73	50		87	83						
HSP	60	63	81	78	83	85	52	56			
WHT	61	42		82	79						
FRL	61	56	79	78	80	75	62	62	80		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	678
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	69
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	
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	77
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	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 Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on the 2021 state assessment, Math proficiency has the lowest percentage in each of the grades 3-5. Although we still outperformed the district and the state, it is clear that this is an area scores are lower.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2021 state assessment, the area that has the greatest need for improvement is Math in grades 3-5.

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

We believe the factors that contributed to this need are the loss of skill due to the pandemic and virtual learning. According to our beginning of year diagnostics for the 2020-2021 school year, our students came in way behind in Math, and our proficiency percentages were extremely low.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Progress monitoring for the 2020-2021 school year did reflect the most improvement in Math in all grades 3-8. However, because the slide was so large, they still had the lowest performance in Math on the state assessment in grades 3-5.

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

We increased our tutoring opportunities and we added tutoring for our primary grades. We also asked for teachers to increase the amount of time in their math blocks.

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

We have added a 30-minute intervention block for all K-5 classes. This block of time will focus on Math skills. Teachers will be working with small groups each day to address the gaps in learning for each group.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We provided professional development to help teachers with differentiated instruction. After doing a needs assessment survey with our teachers, many teachers asked for help in this area.

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

We will continue to offer tutoring starting in October, as well as, the incorporation of the additional math intervention block.

Pinecrest Preparatory will also use iReady, teacher observations and other necessary tools to support increased student learning. The leadership team will conduct observations and provide teachers with actionable feedback. In addition, student data will be monitored to determine if strategies being implemented are effective. During monthly data meetings, formative and summative student data will be discussed to determine whether or not students need additional support. Leadership team members will meet weekly to discuss findings and trends that they have observed within their classroom walkthroughs and PLC meetings.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The leadership team is working with the teachers to identify the students that have been attendance issues and are not following the Code of Conduct as it relates to attendance. We will be setting up attendance committee meetings to see if we can put some accommodations in place to help these students. The leadership team will also develop incentives for students who have good attendance and actively participate. We will also determine if students will need to be placed on an attendance contract or if we need to refer the students for truancy.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

A positive school culture and environment is one of our greatest strengths here at Pinecrest Preparatory Academy. We work hard to be in constant communication with all stakeholders. Our teachers have ongoing open lines of communication with their families. Classroom interactions between our teachers and individual students are highly respectful, reflecting

genuine warmth and caring and sensitivity to students' cultures and levels of development. Students themselves ensure high levels of respect among their peers and demonstrate a genuine appreciation and understanding of diverse cultures and backgrounds. Standards of conduct are clear, with evidence of student understanding of the classroom management system. Our teachers promote high standards and expectations for student behavior and a culture within the classroom of respect, courtesy, and concern among all students.

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

All stakeholders play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment!

Part V: Budget

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

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------