
Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Pinecrest Academy Space Coast

7550 STADIUM PARKWAY, Viera, FL 32940

www.pinecrestspacecoast.com

Demographics

Principal: Sylvia Mijuskovic M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2022

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 21% |
| 2021-22 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 | 2021-22: A (64%) 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: 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 | ATSI |
| * 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 | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Pinecrest Academy Space Coast

7550 STADIUM PARKWAY, Viera, FL 32940

www.pinecrestspacecoast.com

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p> | <p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>21%</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>40%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <p>Year</p> | <p>2021-22</p> | <p>2020-21</p> |
| <p>Grade</p> | <p>A</p> | |

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.

Offering children a state-of-the-art education focusing on a rigorous curriculum with an emphasis on STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) disciplines enhanced by a Spanish dual language program that will create biliterate citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

“Creating biliterate thinkers to succeed in a global community.”

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Mijuskovic, Sylvia | Principal | |
| Barringer, Heather | Assistant Principal | |
| Hammoud, Wendy | Instructional Coach | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/18/2022, Sylvia Mijuskovic M

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

670

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

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 76 | 88 | 69 | 64 | 60 | 73 | 70 | 81 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 659 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 16 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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

Wednesday 10/5/2022

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 | 84 | 61 | 55 | 58 | 69 | 67 | 77 | 82 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 594 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 84 | 61 | 55 | 58 | 69 | 67 | 77 | 82 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 594 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 69% | 63% | 55% | | | | | 65% | 61% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | | | | | | | 58% | 59% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | | | | | | | 54% | 54% |
| Math Achievement | 70% | 40% | 42% | | | | | 67% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | | | | | | | 62% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 37% | | | | | | | 59% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | 61% | 64% | 54% | | | | | 62% | 56% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 90% | 61% | 59% | | | | | 80% | 78% |

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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 43 | 54 | 42 | 36 | 39 | 33 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 60 | 79 | | 93 | 79 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 90 | | | 90 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | 44 | | 52 | 38 | 20 | | | | | |
| HSP | 78 | 69 | 73 | 78 | 67 | | 71 | 100 | 80 | | |
| MUL | 74 | 50 | | 66 | 67 | | 73 | | 91 | | |
| WHT | 67 | 62 | 46 | 69 | 60 | 30 | 62 | 91 | 84 | | |
| FRL | 55 | 50 | 35 | 50 | 49 | 39 | 42 | 79 | 61 | | |
| 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 | 61 | 55 | | 39 | 36 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 92 | | | 92 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 81 | 58 | | 81 | 58 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 77 | 64 | | 57 | 25 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 63 | 50 | 69 | 52 | 44 | 50 | 94 | 77 | | |
| FRL | 50 | 40 | | 40 | 40 | | | | | | |
| 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 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 64 |
| 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 | 575 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 78 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 90 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 42 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 77 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 70 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

We saw some declines in overall proficiency scores, but increases in our overall gains. While our lowest 25% in math was significantly lower than expected, a root analysis of the data shows that most of our proficient students from the previous year were placed in Algebra, leaving our most challenged math students in that group.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the analysis of ELA scores, it would appear that more emphasis needs to be given to Reading, including our most struggling readers in the lowest 25%ile.

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

Of significant impact, COVID has played a significant role in academic gaps, particularly this past year where we saw the impact of the gaps in the classroom. A more robust MTSS system has been implemented, with ongoing progress monitoring data, a daily, scheduled Rtl time along with afterschool interventions.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains in Math.

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

Our school prides itself in very strong teachers. This year we are expanding our Project Based Learning to allow students the ability to apply their learning into real world relevant situations.

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

Middle school students are already on an accelerated track. Quarterly IReady data is reviewed by administration, data chats are held with teachers who must provide evidence of enrichment strategies for those student exceeding grade level expectations.

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.

Ongoing training in BEST standards, Lesson Targets, IReady, PBL and data analysis.

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

Intensive after school tutorial, strategic approach to Rtl and MTSS along with a scheduled summer school program for struggling students.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our overall science proficiency rate was higher than the district and state, a huge improvement over last year's comparison. At 57% pass rate in 5th grade and 64% pass rate in 8th grade, our overall proficiency rate was 61%.

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

With a focus on professional learning communities, 65% of 5th grade students will demonstrate proficiency as evidenced by the results of the 2022-2023 state assessment while 70% of our 8th graders will demonstrate proficiency in the Biology EOC.

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

Using the MAPS progress monitoring tool, teachers will determine the gaps in learning and provide differentiated lessons and activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being

A professional learning community (PLC) involves much more than a staff meeting or group of teachers getting together to discuss a book they've read. Instead, a PLC represents the institutionalization of a focus on continuous improvement in staff performance as well as student learning. Called "the most powerful professional development and change strategy available," PLCs, when done well, lead to reliable growth in student learning. In a nutshell, PLCs entail whole-staff involvement in a process of intensive reflection upon instructional practices and desired student benchmarks, as well as monitoring of outcomes to ensure success. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn

implemented for this Area of Focus.

from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

A professional learning community, or PLC, is a group of educators who decide to come together regularly to learn with and from each other on needs they have identified themselves. ... They talk about the value of collaboration and how their PLC have helped them stay connected and supported.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Continue the engagement students in STEM through STEM Scopes curriculum and a separate STEAM program offered as a weekly special.

Person Responsible Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Create a STEM-themed poster that highlights the STEM objectives being highlighted throughout the other disciplines.

Person Responsible Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Develop a Year At A Glance framework in Math and ELA which integrate STEM-related lessons.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Have the instructional coach attend grade level meetings with teachers to ensure vertical alignment of grades 3-5 science instruction.

Person Responsible Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Utilize the instructional coach in observing, providing feedback and modeling for new and struggling teachers.

Person Responsible Wendy Hammoud (whammoud@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Develop a non-negotiable schedule that requires teachers to meet and plan during common planning periods.

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Develop a meeting schedule that requires grade level chairs to meet with their teams monthly to discuss data, progress monitoring obstacles, best practices and celebrate successes

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Develop a meeting schedule that requires the leadership team (comprised of all grade level representatives, STEM and Bilingual Coordinator) to meet with administrative team and share information, celebrations and obstacles discussed during their PLC times.

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

Upon analysis, our lowest 25% quartile students schoolwide showed a lower performance in learning gains related to their peers' school-wide. This subgroup's Language Arts learning gains were 44%, compared to their peer's 61%. Our overall math learning gains were 61%, a huge improvement over last year's gain. Our lowest 25% quartile learning gains were 37%. It should be noted, however, that most of the students who scored levels 3 and above were placed in the advanced track of Algebra, leaving the highest struggling students in this category.

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

With a focus on standards-based instruction and small group instruction, 55% of the Math and ELA students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains as evidenced by the results of the 2023 FAST administration.

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

I-Ready data will be administered quarterly. Data chats will be held among grade levels, grade level team leaders and administrators. Teachers will utilize the data to create and conduct small group instruction around remediation and enrichment. Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers on how the data is modifying instruction.

Person**responsible****for****monitoring****outcome:**

Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Evidence-**based****Strategy:****Describe the****evidence-****based****strategy****being****implemented****for this Area****of Focus.**

Small group instruction usually follows whole group instruction to reinforce or reteach specific skills and concepts and provides a reduced student-teacher ratio. Small groups typically range in size from four to six students.

1. Personalize Instruction:

Small group instruction allows teachers to work more closely with each student. This type of instruction provides the opportunity to evaluate students' learning strengths, locate gaps in the development of their reading or math skills and tailor lessons focused on specific learning objectives. In addition, small group instruction allows teachers to check for understanding, reinforce skills presented in whole group instruction, and/or change the pacing of a lesson (i.e., teachers may break down concepts not easily understood or quickly pass through lessons that students clearly understand).

2. Provide Feedback:

Small group instruction allows a teacher to monitor student actions more closely and to provide frequent and individualized feedback at point of use to improve specific reading or math skills.

3. Reteach or Preteach:

Small group instruction is an opportunity for teachers to provide additional teaching and practice often needed for struggling students to master important skills or understand key concepts (e.g., phonemic awareness skill of manipulating ending sounds, or operations with whole numbers or rational numbers). Through the use of diagnostic assessments, a teacher can determine skills or concepts for which students may need more instructional support. Small group instruction also provides an opportunity for teachers to pre-teach specific vocabulary, challenging text structures, or other prerequisite knowledge to English learners or any students who may experience difficulty in upcoming lessons.

4. Build Confidence Through Collaboration:

Small group instruction can provide a comfortable environment and boost the confidence of students who might not otherwise participate in a lesson or activity. Small group instruction encourages teamwork as everyone in the group is working toward achieving the same goal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research has shown that unless students are provided additional instruction to fill learning gaps, the chances of achieving grade level standards is challenged. Of great importance is the ability to also target the enrichment students through this strategy, as often times, the remediation approach negatively impacts those on grade level and above.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Instructional assistants will be assigned to classes during ELA and/or Math time in grade 3 in order to assist the teachers with small group interventions.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Full-time instructional assistants will be assigned to all K-2 classes in order to assist teachers with small group instruction.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Teachers will create an intervention schedule that supports his/her academic areas. Students will rotate through groups to receive additional instruction and support.

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Provide every teacher with release time mid-year to hold academic data chats with parents including an "at home" academic plan where parents can provide additional academic support.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Students not demonstrating adequate progress will be referred to the IPST team for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Conduct a parent information night to review the school grade data, explain school wide plan to address struggling students and explain the concept of the lowest 25%.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Incorporate 30-45 minutes of interventions/enrichment during after school program. Utilize middle school students to teach lower grade students concepts they need help with.

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Using FAST and I Ready data, struggling students will be identified and placed in intensive after school tutoring.

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

During data chats with administration, teachers will have to identify what strategies and efforts and being implemented for student in the enrichment category.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

A substantial number of students declined in FSA scores/levels in ELA and Math during the 2021-2022 school year. In ELA, Pinecrest saw a decline of 9% points going from 78% proficiency to 69%. In Math, there was decline of 1% point going from 62% proficient to 61%.

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

With a focus on standards-based instruction, 75% of the students will demonstrate proficiency in ELA and Math on the PM 3 administration of the FAST.

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

Data chats comparing FAST and I Ready data will be conducted after the administration of each progress monitoring window.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Standards based instruction helps guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of student learning. ... Expectations for student learning are mapped out with each prescribed standard. Teachers follow standards-based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) has spent an enormous amount of resources, money and time researching and training in standards-based instruction. Data is demonstrating the benefit in this approach.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Conduct a training during pre-planning on standards-based learning, utilizing learning targets in the classroom and on the creation of a Year at a Glance framework.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Ensure that teachers are posting their learning targets during walkthroughs and informal observations to ensure students develop an understanding of their learning and keep the focus of the standard.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Expect teachers to use differentiated instruction based on day-to-day data in order to accelerate learning.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

During data chats, special notice will be given to the students identified in the objective as well as the progress of students that achieved a level 4 or 5 last year. This will ensure no regression in their learning.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

When reviewing data during data chats, special attention will be placed on the progress of all groups to ensure that all groups are showing improvement. Groups/Students not showing progress will be recommended for after school tutoring.

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Teachers will meet with students after each progress monitoring test to review the data and establish goals for the next test administration.

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Screen all level 4 and 5 students for gifted testing to ensure their academic skills are being challenged and addressed.

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

During data chats, review the progress of students in the gifted program to ensure steady progress of those students and/or provide them with additional assistance and support.

Person Responsible Heather Barringer (hbarringer@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Celebrate success of learning gains throughout the year during progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

Conduct student assemblies and pep rallies before testing in April to ensure students understand the importance of testing and offer the students a positive approach to testing days.

Person Responsible Sylvia Mijuskovic (smijuskovic@pinecrestspacecoast.com)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Pinecrest Space Coast Academy prides itself in creating a positive school culture throughout the day every day. Some of our efforts include:

- C.H.A.M.P.S. Positive Behavior School wide program
- Monthly Student of the month awards and breakfast with the principal
- Ambassador program in 8th grade
- Student Government
- Monthly celebrations of good teaching and culture during faculty meetings
- Numerous community events to promote unity

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

The entire administrative team is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of all above activities.