Pineapple Cove Classical Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy

6162 MINTON RD NW, Palm Bay, FL 32907

http://www.pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Last revision date 8/2015

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy is affiliated with Hillsdale College's Barney Charter School initiative. We will offer a unique option for families providing students with a K-12 option for classical education on one campus. Students will receive a cohesive Classical education, which builds upon itself year after year, creating a successful foundation for learning. Students will be intentionally taught the benefits of a virtuous character and will be challenged through the lessons taught within the curriculum to develop and strengthen their character. Our teachers will provide the support and attention students require in order to meet the high expectations of a Classical education. The strong leadership of our Board, Administration, and Teachers will provide an excellent example of character for our students.

Last revision date 9/12/21 (grade level)

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wheeler, Lisa	Principal	The School Leadership Team is responsible for the overall guidance and leadership of the school. The team oversees the implementation of curriculum, school-wide discipline, and community relations. The leadership team supports teachers and staff, analyzes data to determine student needs, and serves on the school attendance committee. In addition to the duties listed above, the principal is also responsible for the hiring and evaluation of teachers and staff, ensuring school safety and security, including the Threat Assessment Team, the maintenance and upkeep of the school grounds and facilities, reporting and communicating with the school's governing board and Hillsdale College, maintaining compliance with district and authorizer requirements, evaluating professional development needs for the school, and implementing necessary training.
Kraus, Miranda	Assistant Principal	In addition to the job duties listed above, Mrs. Kraus is the testing coordinator for grades K-6. In addition, she supports teacher and staff evaluations, serves as a contact/organizer of our extracurricular activities, and designs school-wide and student schedules.
Gunter, Kelly	Other	Mrs. Gunter is our Director of Schools. In addition to duties listed above, Mrs. Gunter manages the school budget, advises on financial matters, guides teachers and ensures compliance with certification, and manages Charter Tools to ensure compliance with Office of Leading and Learning.
Johns, Michelle	Assistant Principal	In addition to the job duties listed above, Mrs. Johns is the testing coordinator for grades 7-12. In addition, she assists with teacher and staff evaluations, serves as a contact/organizer of our extracurricular activities, and designs school-wide and student schedules.
Hayford, Leslie	Other	In addition to the responsibilities of the School Leadership Team, Mrs. Hayford serves as our ESOL contact and interventionist for struggling students, if needed. She also coaches new teachers in the policies and procedures of our school. This includes day to day operations, as well as instructional practices.
Gilbert, Stacey	Assistant Principal	In addition to the job duties listed above, Ms. Gilbert supports teacher evaluations and is the discipline contact for grades 7-12. She works closely with our guidance department and mentors scholars.
Braun, Michelle	Dean	In addition to the job duties listed above, Mrs. Braun is the discipline contact for grades K-6. She works closely with our guidance department and mentors scholars.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

In preparation for writing this year's school improvement plan, data were collected from a variety of sources. Families and teachers provided information in end of year surveys that involved topics of school culture, satisfaction, and needs for professional development. Administrative teams examined scholar data and determined areas of strengths and weaknesses. Plans for improvement were discussed with the ESE teams, interventionists, and teachers during preplanning. In addition, collaboration between our three campuses was beneficial.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We have scheduled quarterly meetings with our administrative and instructional teams to review student data and IPST progress. Part of these meetings will involve review of the SIP and our advancement toward these goals.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	25%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	3	5	3	4	2	1	4	3	1	26
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	4	3	2	4	15	32
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	4	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	5	7	6	19	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	12	6	4	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	5	16	9	5	7	6	19	83

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	1	2	2	3	4	8	25

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	5	10	8	7	10	20	8	5	12	102
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	0	4	2	2	2	13	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	7	4	8	13	78
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	9	6	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	0	0	3	5	4	7	6	44

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	5	10	8	7	10	20	8	5	12	85
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	0	4	2	2	2	13	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	7	4	8	13	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	9	6	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	0	0	3	5	4	7	6	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63	58	53	64	63	55	74		
ELA Learning Gains				53			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			49		
Math Achievement*	76	62	55	78	40	42	73		
Math Learning Gains				69			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			58		
Science Achievement*	61	61	52	66	64	54	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	88	72	68	79	61	59	83		
Middle School Acceleration	53	70	70	43	51	51	52		
Graduation Rate	90	87	74		62	50			
College and Career Acceleration	52	75	53		76	70			
ELP Progress	75	47	55	68	68	70	68		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	632
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	90

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	3	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	61			
HSP	63			
MUL	76			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	73			
FRL	63			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	2	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	55			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	58			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	63			76			61	88	53	90	52	75
SWD	30			45			29	55			5	
ELL	41			47			42	62			5	75
AMI												
ASN	75			92							2	
BLK	53			65			48	77			4	
HSP	51			67			56	85	35		6	82

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	78			79			58	90			4	
PAC												
WHT	66			79			65	89	61	60	8	
FRL	52			66			39	74	60		7	83

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	64	53	38	78	69	53	66	79	43			68
SWD	32	35	27	48	53	43	28	44				
ELL	29	35	30	50	60	52	26					68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	65	58	53	69	66	47	55	45				
HSP	60	50	41	68	67	48	67	66	37			50
MUL	69	55		79	68		71	90				
PAC												
WHT	65	52	33	82	70	57	67	85	45			
FRL	64	59	64	72	61	53	35					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	74	65	49	73	63	58	67	83	52			68
SWD	44	56	42	39	56	50	38	47				
ELL	44	56	50	38	56	67	33					68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	63	42		57	58		20	91				
HSP	68	65	48	69	61	59	55	78	69			57
MUL	76	71		81	48							
PAC												
WHT	76	66	54	75	65	63	73	82	50			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	65	64	50	65	64	62	68					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
10	2023 - Spring	67%	54%	13%	50%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	53%	9%	47%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	47%	11%
09	2023 - Spring	62%	56%	6%	48%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	61%	13%	58%	16%
06	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	47%	23%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	56%	16%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	67%	16%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	48%	31%
03	2023 - Spring	85%	60%	25%	59%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	61%	12%	61%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	38%	21%	55%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	55%	23%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	48%	5%	44%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	57%	-12%	51%	-6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	51%	40%	50%	41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	50%	29%	48%	31%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	61%	21%	63%	19%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	69%	16%	66%	19%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	62%	29%	63%	28%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 a continuation from last year, we've noted a need for improvement in our ELA scores. In fifth grade, we saw our ELA performance drop on FAST when comparing cohorts. In addition, our 8th grade scores

increased by a couple of percentage points, but are still below 60% proficiency rate. Last year, a long-term substitute was hired for this class due to a staffing change at the very beginning of the school year.

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

Our greatest decline was in 5th grade. This grade level's performance in ELA dropped 21% points from the previous year when comparing cohorts. Fifth grade had two second year teachers and ESE students comprised 11% of the population. While the proficiency rate is above the state's average of 55%, it is below the district's average of 58%.

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.

Our fifth grade science scores had the greatest gap when compared to district and state averages. Our fifth grade scholars had a proficiency rate of 45%, while the state proficiency rate was 51% and the district proficiency rate was 57%. In the past year, we experienced some curricular realignment to our Core Knowledge sequence. This required additional planning and preparation. This team also had two second-year teachers.

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

Our math scores increased 11 percentage points when studying the third to fourth grade cohort. Focused instruction from our elementary math interventionist supported our lowest performing scholars in all K-6 grade levels.
We were also proud that 100% of our third graders were promoted and Jr/Sr scholars in Alg 1 and Geometry had incredible proficiency rates. Placement of scholars in Alg 1 has been very successful, with a 100% proficiency rate. Scholars in Geometry had a 79% proficiency rate.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

In reviewing our Early Warning Systems data, a concern is presented in number of scholars with suspensions in 8th grade last year. This is due to a couple of factors, we had some new scholars enter our eighth grade and two of the teachers on the grade level were first year teachers.

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

ELA and ESE Subgroups
New Teacher Support and retention

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In reviewing FAST data, we noted the following for each grade level:
4th grade- Strength- Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary, Weakness- Reading Informational Text
5th grade- Strength- Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary, Weakness- Reading Informational Text
6th grade- Strength- Reading Informational Text, Weakness- Prose and Poetry
7th grade- Strength- Reading Informational Text, Weakness- Prose and Poetry
8th grade- Strength- Reading Informational Text, Weakness- Prose and Poetry/Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary
9th-12th grades- Strength- Prose and Poetry, Weakness- Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary
Our ESE population is struggling in the area of ELA and learning gains are not strong enough. We intend to continue our focus in this area. The DOE has stated a focus is required here, as we are an ATSI school.

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

In 2024, PCCA will continue FAST assessment. Using this data, we hope to see that proficiency rates for all scholars rise to a minimum of 70%.

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

Student data will be collected using STAR and FAST. This proficiency data will be analyzed after each testing window to determine needs for growth during grade level meetings. In addition, informal classroom walkthroughs will conducted and discussed among the administrative team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

ESE teachers will work closely with classroom teachers to provide small group instruction and push-in support to accelerate learning. These groups will use information from FAST reading and math testing to determine needs for instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaboration between our ESE and General Education teachers will ensure that both parties have essential information and best practices when working with our ESE population.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

IPST teams and administration meet quarterly to review data with grade levels and departments. This review will provide regular check-ins of scholar progress and devoted time to review goals and progress.

Person Responsible: Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

By When: This began with review of data for SIP writing and will be conducted quarterly.

Additional staff have been added to support our ESE population. In the elementary building, a second assistant has been added to provide additional help with our primary needs. Our new elementary reading interventionist is also ESE certified and will provide support while in classrooms and working with small groups. In the Jr/Sr building, our eighth grade teacher has an additional planning to assist with interventions as needed. Last year, we added a second ESE assistant to help the team and have added a Personal Care Assistant this year to assist with the needs of one scholar. We intend to have our assistants support testing accommodations so that teachers can focus on instruction.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: August of 2023

Mentoring will be provided to our elementary scholars who performed in the lowest 25th percentile. The activity team will be providing additional support through one on one reading times and data reviews with this group during their Science/Math Enrichment activity.

Person Responsible: Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

By When: Mentoring will begin by September 15.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

While our number of new teachers has decreased from last year, we still have 10 new to teaching or new to PCCA teachers on staff. This equates about 12% of our faculty. Our entire country is feeling the effects of a teacher shortage and we are not immune to this problem. Many teachers are coming to the field through alternative certification and are beginning teaching with a temporary certificate. The early years of teaching are stressful and support is necessary.

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

In May of 2024, we will improve teacher retention by 50%.

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

Monthly check-ins with new-to-PCCA teachers (by teacher mentors, mentor leads, new teacher trainers, and admin) will help to determine teacher stamina and confidence in teaching a classical curriculum. Classroom walkthroughs (documented through Google Form submissions by members of admin) will be reviewed bi-weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Increased coaching and professional development will be provided to those new to PCCA.
Our team of instructional coaches has grown this year to include two literacy coaches and two math coaches. This team will visit classrooms of new teachers on a regular basis to ensure fidelity of instruction. Coaches will also meet with teachers to discuss student data and pedagogy.
Our new teacher trainer and mentors will host meetings to discuss relevant topics with new educators, such as parent communication, grading, report cards, planning, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Training happens best when it is job-embedded. When coaches can be in classrooms, they are able to model and observe best practices and provide timely feedback.
Frequent check-ins with new educators will allow all to ask/answer questions in a risk-free environment, growing confidence in our new educators.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

New to teaching and new to PCCA elementary teachers will be coached in the use of Literacy Essentials and Singapore Dimensions classroom practices by our instructional coaches.

New to teaching and new to PCCA teachers in our Jr/Sr building will be supported by Mrs. Austin, a veteran teacher with an additional planning period. She will plan regular visits and observations with our first and second year teachers. In addition, our department leads will provide monthly support in appropriate topics that relate to job performance.

Person Responsible: Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

By When: Mentoring support will begin during preplanning and continue throughout the year.

Administrators will increase presence in classrooms. Administrators all have all set two week goals to visit certain grade levels or departments. Walkthrough data will be shared via a Google Form and discussed at bi-weekly admin meetings.

Person Responsible: Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

By When: Classroom visits will begin August 10 and continue throughout the year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Our instructional staff have opportunities for professional development through Brevard Public Schools and offerings provided by our school during preplanning, faculty meetings, and professional development days. If additional supports are provided through BPS, we will be sure to participate.

One of our Areas of Focus details the need for additional support and resources for our ESE subgroup. We will continue to make this priority.