Pineapple Cove Classical Academy At West Melbourne School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy At West Melbourne

3455 NORFOLK PKWY, West Melbourne, FL 32904

www.pineapplecoveclassicalacademywm.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 at West Melbourne 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. Instituted August 2018

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy at West Melbourne is affiliated with Hillsdale College's Barney Charter School initiative. We will offer an unique option for families providing students with a K-8 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. Revised August 2020

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
Melian, Michelle	Principal	Oversees the daily operations and implementation of the academic goals of the school.

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.

SIP goals are determined based on the academic performance of the school, and end of year family and faculty surveys. The Governing Board serves as the SAC.

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))

SIP goals are monitored by the academic team after each progress monitoring period. Academic results are presented at the Governing Board meetings. Admin will revisit the SIP goals every period to evaluate the need for revision.

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-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	32%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B
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	13	14	10	10	10	9	8	10	9	93
One or more suspensions	9	5	9	3	7	6	14	16	2	71
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	16	17	23	6	8	5	4	9	5	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	29	9	23	22	32	19	10	8	5	157
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	

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	20	10	11	11	15	7	7	9	5	95

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	2	1	0	3	1	0	1	0	1	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	3	2	0	1	1	2	5	7	7	28
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	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	3	0	3	4	3	4	11	4	32

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	3	2	0	1	1	2	5	7	7	28
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	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	3	0	3	4	3	4	11	4	32

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	65	58	53	70	63	55	77		
ELA Learning Gains				57			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			57		
Math Achievement*	66	62	55	73	40	42	74		
Math Learning Gains				68			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			60		
Science Achievement*	62	61	52	71	64	54	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	90	72	68	90	61	59	85		
Middle School Acceleration	83	70	70	72	51	51	53		
Graduation Rate		87	74		62	50			
College and Career Acceleration		75	53		76	70			
ELP Progress	55	47	55	78	68	70			

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	684
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	52			
HSP	70			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	58			

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	46			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	46			
HSP	62			

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%
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	53			

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	65			66			62	90	83			55
SWD	34			39			40				4	
ELL	46			54			55				4	55
AMI												
ASN	83			78							2	
BLK	53			58			45				3	
HSP	69			67			66		83		5	
MUL	61			58			43				3	
PAC												
WHT	63			67			64	89	79		6	
FRL	56			57			52	80	64		6	

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	70	57	44	73	68	61	71	90	72			78
SWD	38	43	47	49	55	54	36					
ELL	52	41	30	70	75	90						78
AMI												
ASN	87	82		96	82		90					

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
BLK	43	46		43	50							
HSP	74	54	40	69	58	35	78	89				
MUL	55	50	33	72	78	80	60					
PAC												
WHT	71	57	48	74	69	65	71	91	80			
FRL	57	44	29	59	59	47	49	80				

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	77	68	57	74	68	60	66	85	53			
SWD	45			50								
ELL	85	62		80	77							
AMI												
ASN	91	62		95	69		80					
BLK	55			60								
HSP	69	60		68	70		40					
MUL	53	53		59	53		27					
PAC												
WHT	80	71	58	75	72	69	71	82	54			
FRL	64	66	50	67	67	65	42					

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
05	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	54%	9%
07	2023 - Spring	58%	53%	5%	47%	11%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	47%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	58%	9%
06	2023 - Spring	76%	61%	15%	47%	29%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	56%	4%	50%	10%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	89%	67%	22%	54%	35%
07	2023 - Spring	71%	58%	13%	48%	23%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	60%	-12%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	61%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	38%	10%	55%	-7%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	55%	20%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	61%	48%	13%	44%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	57%	5%	51%	11%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	51%	45%	50%	46%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	48%	*

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	69%	22%	66%	25%

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.

The lowest performance areas were 3rd grade and 4th grade ELA and Math. We saw drops of more than 5% in proficiency. These are students who were in primary grades during COVID and are still experiencing learning loss. We also had turnover on our 4th grade team which we believe contributed to lower scores.

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

3rd grade Math and 4th grade Math experienced the greatest decline. These are students who were in primary grades during COVID and are still experiencing learning loss. We also had turnover on our 4th grade team which we believe contributed to lower scores. Teachers on both of these teams are less experienced than other grade levels.

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.

3rd grade Math and 4th grade Math. All other proficiency scores were above the state. These are students who were in primary grades during COVID and are still experiencing learning loss. We also had turnover on our 4th grade team which we believe contributed to lower scores. Teachers on both of these teams are less experienced than other grade levels.

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

Algebra 1 scores went from 88 to 96%. Last year we instituted regular peer tutoring sessions, supervised by one of our instructors. We also promoted our Level 3 students to Algebra and provided additional classroom support.

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

One area is a significant number of low/Level 1 scores in Math, particularly in K-4.

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

Increase Math achievement overall.
Increase ELA and Math Achievement for SWD subgroup.

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 Math

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.

We analyzed the 22-23 student assessment scores for FAST and STAR Math AP3, and found that proficiency scores were lacking in these particular areas.

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

Students in 3rd and 4th grade will improve Math proficiency by 10% during AP3.

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

We will monitor the assessment scores after PM1 and PM2 to track progress, and hold grade level meetings to discuss results and modify instruction as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Melian (melianm@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.)

We hired two 2 certified Math Coaches, and provided 4 hours of Professional Development to all K-6 teachers during pre-planning to support Singapore Math curriculum that we utilize.

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

Research shows that increased teacher confidence and buy-in result in improved efficiency in instructional practice, which in turn increases student performance. Additionally, certified Math Coaches provide consistent guidelines, structure and assessment of instructional delivery and the Math block.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Hire two qualified, certified Math coaches.

Person Responsible: Kelly Gunter (kgunter@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

By When: Start of the school year.

Schedule 4 hours of Singapore Math refresher training during pre-planning.

Person Responsible: Kelly Gunter (kgunter@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

By When: Start of pre-planning.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

We analyzed the 22-23 student assessment scores for FAST and STAR ELA and Math AP3.

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

We will improve the proficiency scores of our SWD subgroup in ELA and Math by 5% on AP3.

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

We will monitor the assessment scores after PM1 and PM2 to track progress, and hold grade level meetings to discuss results and modify instruction as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Lopez (lopezl@pccafl.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.)

We will hire additional staff to help reduce the student to teacher ratio.

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

Research shows that lowering the student to teacher ratio is beneficial to students and increases performance for students with disabilities.

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.

Hire ESE certified teacher.

Person Responsible: Michelle Melian (melianm@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

By When: First day of school 8/10/2023.