Pineapple Cove Classical Academy At Lockmar School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy At Lockmar

720 EMERSON DRIVE NE, Palm Bay, FL 32907

https://pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com/lockmar-campus/

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.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy is a curriculum school partnered with Hillsdale College's Barney Charter School initiative. We will offer a 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.

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
Koblitz, Paris	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.
Ottinger, John	Assistant Principal	In addition to the job duties listed above, Mr. Ottinger is the testing coordinator for grades K-8. In addition, he is the curriculum contact for grades K-8, assists with teacher and staff evaluations, the Title IX Coordinator, and TMT Chair.
Haber, Eddie	Dean	In addition to the job duties listed above, Mr. Haber supports teacher evaluations and is the discipline contact for grades K-8. He works closely with our guidance department and mentors scholars.
Holmes, Brittany	Other	In addition to the responsibilities of the School Leadership Team, Mrs. Holmes serves as our liaison between administration and K-8 students, teachers, and parents. She is also our yearbook coordinator, contact for all field trips, and supports in the design and planning of all schoolwide events.
Butler, Jennifer	Other	In addition to the responsibilities of the School Leadership Team, Mrs. Butler serves as our ESE contact, ESOL contact, and interventionist for struggling students. She also coaches new teachers in the policies and procedures of our school. This includes day to day operations, as well as instructional practices.

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.

School Surveys

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))

Evidence of Implementation and impact
Teacher observations
Student Data - impact

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	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
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)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
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	1	14	12	8	6	9	10	2	4	66
One or more suspensions	0	2	10	4	8	12	8	13	7	64
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	5	1	4	8	5	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	1	2	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	2	8	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	9	8	36
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	1	1

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	0	1	0	3	8	6	7	7	32

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	1	5	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
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	5	3	3	8	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	7	7	7	0	26
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	0	0	1	4	2	1	4	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	8	2	5	4	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	5

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
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	5	3	3	8	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	7	7	7	0	26
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	0	0	1	4	2	1	4	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	8	2	5	4	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	5

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*	61	58	53		63	55			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	60	62	55		40	42			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	48	61	52		64	54			
Social Studies Achievement*	71	72	68		61	59			
Middle School Acceleration		70	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate		87	74		62	50			
College and Career Acceleration		75	53		76	70			
ELP Progress	56	47	55		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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	366
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	61			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	45			

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				

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				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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	61			60			48	71				56
SWD	24			39							3	
ELL											1	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49			46							2	
HSP	57			57			73	55			5	
MUL	64			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			64			41	69			5	
FRL	47			52			25	60			5	

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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											
HSP											
MUL											
PAC											
WHT											
FRL											

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											
SWD											
ELL											
AMI											
ASN											
BLK											
HSP											
MUL											
PAC											
WHT											
FRL											

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	50%	53%	-3%	47%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2023 - Spring	68%	61%	7%	58%	10%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	47%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	56%	12%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	47%	67%	-20%	54%	-7%
07	2023 - Spring	65%	58%	7%	48%	17%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	60%	23%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	61%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	55%	-7%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	48%	57%	-9%	51%	-3%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	69%	-1%	66%	2%

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-performing indicator was attendance. Across the grade levels, there were significant issues with attendance. The low performance was likely due to several factors: 1. Families had gotten used to using COVID absence exemptions whenever scholars were ill and became used to keeping scholars out longer than needed; 2. The district started using a new system for reporting absences, which had various technical glitches and on which our absence coordinator still needed training; 3. The absence coordinator at our school was new to the role and did not know all of the proper processes. 4. As a

charter school, we do not receive the same services from the district in regard to truancy as the district schools do - however, this was not made clear till late in the year and was a change from prior years.

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

The 22-23 school year was our first year in operation, so we do not have comparative data from the 21-22 school year.

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.

Analysis of state testing data shows that scholars in 5th and 6th grade performed below the state average in mathematics on the new FAST test. In part, this is due to the fact that scholars were coming from a variety of schools with various teaching methods and pedagogy for math. Another factor was that these scholars had to transition into a new pedagogy of math instruction that takes time to master. Finally, scholars are still working to repair gaps from learning loss due to Covid and the virtual learning experience.

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

The 22-23 school year was our first year in operation, so we do not have comparative data from the 21-22 school year.

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

Reflecting on the EWS for the 2022-2023 school year, one area concern would be students who were absent 10% or more days.

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

Our highest priorities would be to improve student attendance, repair learning loss in the area of mathematics, particularly for scholars who have now been promoted to grades 6 and 7, and improve civic literacy scores, as evidenced by the Civics end-of-course exam for 7th graders.

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 the 22-23 FAST ELA PM3 data, we have the greatest need for improvement with our current seventh graders. In seventh grade, only 28% of this group scored a level 3 or higher on the FAST ELA PM3. To improve the performance of this group, we will closely monitor progress using FAST ELA, provide additional assistance in the classroom, and provide tutoring opportunities.

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

23-24 PCCA Lockmar will be taking the FAST assessment and utilizing this data to drive instructional practices to improve Reading scores on the PM3 assessment.

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

FAST ELA Assessment data will be collected 3 times a year and analyzed in teacher grade level meetings. In addition, administration will support teachers with classroom walkthroughs, instructional plan reviews, and instructional coaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Ottinger (ottingerj@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.)

Our teachers will use modeling, graphic organizers, and direct instruction to help scholars improve their reading comprehension skills.

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

These evidence based strategies have been vetted and proven effective at our other campuses, utilizing the same curriculum and methods of instruction.

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.

We will monitor progress three times a year to measure student performance.

Person Responsible: John Ottinger (ottingerj@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

By When: September, January, and May | 23-24 school year

We will monitor progress three times a year to measure student performance.

Person Responsible: John Ottinger (ottingerj@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

By When: September, January, and May | 23-24 school year

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Building a positive school culture centers on ensuring stakeholders - families, students, teachers, staff, and the community - are proud to be affiliated with the school. For teachers and staff, this is an environment where they feel supported and able to be successful because the tools and time are provided for their success in providing a learning environment that challenges and rewards scholars with an education. These teachers then respect and care for the scholars, ensuring that the opportunity to learn and grow is always present and taking pleasure in learning together. Various rules and procedures, as well as consistency in teaching and expectations, help scholars to feel respected and cared for. Using that same consistency, families and the community become aware that their scholars are provided a safe and robust learning environment that is producing virtuous, intelligent American citizens who will be great contributors to the betterment of all in their community.

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

PCCA Lockmar works to get input from our various stakeholders so that they are always able to help us create and promote a positive school environment. Regular check-ins with teachers and staff in formal and informal ways - such as faculty meetings, one-on-one meetings, and anonymous surveys - help us to get a feel for the general atmosphere of the school. From this information, we are able to establish rules and procedures, which the teachers and staff then implement and give feedback on. Students have also become, over the past year, some of the best builders of the community by setting both individual and group expectations to live out the virtues of the school. They have become advocates for the good and the true and advocates for themselves and others. Parents and family members help us promote a positive school environment by supporting the school through PTO events such as book fairs, movie nights, fundraisers, and sports, and provide volunteers always at the ready for any event or task where additional people would make whatever we are doing go smoother. They also support a positive culture by working closely with teachers and staff to ensure positive outcomes for scholars. Our Governing Board consists of members of the community as well as parents in the school and serves to keep the school mission-focused. We are deeply connected to our First Responders in the community and work with the police and fire departments of Palm Bay to train teachers and ensure school safety. Each individual connected with the school works to promote school culture by praising the hard work of our teachers and scholars as they seek to learn the true, do the good, and love the beautiful.

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

Faculty Meetings, Faculty and staff Surveys, Parent Surveys, Parent Volunteer Hours, and Faculty and Staff Volunteer Hours at Events

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paris Koblitz (koblitzp@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.)

End of the year staff and parent surveys will be implemented and compared to our previous year's results.

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

Utilizing the end year staff and parent surveys, which contain several questions that pertain to positive culture and environment.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus