

Brevard Public Schools

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy

6162 MINTON RD NW, Palm Bay, FL 32907

<http://www.pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com>

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Wheeler

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part 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-11 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 8/12/20 (grade level)

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wheeler, Lisa	Principal	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Ottinger, John	Assistant Principal	<p>In addition to the job duties listed above, Mr. Ottinger is the testing coordinator for grades 7-11. In addition, he assists with teacher and staff evaluations, serves as a contact/organizer of our extracurricular activities, and designs school-wide and student schedules.</p>
Blain, Miranda	Administrative Support	<p>In addition to the responsibilities of the School Leadership Team, Ms. Blain serves as an 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.</p>
Engeron, Tara	Assistant Principal	<p>In addition to the job duties listed above, Ms. Engeron 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.</p>
Johns, Michelle	Administrative Support	<p>In addition to the responsibilities of the School Leadership Team, Mrs. Johns 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.</p>
Gunter, Kelly	Other	<p>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, manages Charter Tools to ensure compliance with Office of EIC.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
	Assistant Principal	
Ramirez, Manuel	Assistant Principal	In addition to the job duties listed above, Mr. Ramirez is the discipline contact for grades 7-11. He works closely with our guidance department and mentors scholars.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Lisa Wheeler

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

2

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students

School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	73	70	71	87	88	106	100	105	79	42	34	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	3	11	5	7	4	5	11	13	10	10	5	2	0	86
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	0	1	2	7	3	10	3	1	2	0	33
Course failure in ELA	5	5	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	3	2	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	5	5	1	1	1	0	1	1	3	2	0	1	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	8	10	0	6	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	6	18	5	1	3	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	1	1	0	2	3	2	4	13	6	1	2	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	5	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	73	71	72	86	88	88	106	104	56	41	0	0	857
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	4	2	2	3	7	8	3	6	3	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	0	2	1	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	7	4	5	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	8	4	21	17	4	8	0	0	70

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	4	5	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	73	71	72	86	88	88	106	104	56	41	0	0	857
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	4	2	2	3	7	8	3	6	3	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	0	2	1	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	7	4	5	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	8	4	21	17	4	8	0	0	70

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year		3	7	4	5	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	65%	61%	73%	68%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	58%	59%	59%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	54%	54%	52%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	77%	67%	62%	71%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	62%	59%	73%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	59%	52%	70%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	68%	62%	56%	64%	63%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	80%	78%	85%	81%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	80%	64%	16%	58%	22%
	2018	77%	63%	14%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	61%	7%	58%	10%
	2018	77%	57%	20%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
	2018	66%	54%	12%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	53%	60%	-7%	54%	-1%
	2018	73%	63%	10%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2019	65%	58%	7%	52%	13%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	60%	63%	-3%	56%	4%
	2018	80%	65%	15%	58%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
09	2019	62%	62%	0%	55%	7%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	61%	7%	62%	6%
	2018	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
	2018	84%	59%	25%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	97%	60%	37%	60%	37%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
06	2019	67%	67%	0%	55%	12%
	2018	77%	68%	9%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
07	2019	90%	62%	28%	54%	36%
	2018	78%	62%	16%	54%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	74%	43%	31%	46%	28%
	2018	54%	41%	13%	45%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	68%	56%	12%	53%	15%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	62%	53%	9%	48%	14%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	50%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	66%	11%	67%	10%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	74%	6%	71%	9%
2018	86%	73%	13%	71%	15%
Compare		-6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	61%	22%	61%	22%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		-12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	50	45	47	46	33	30				
ELL	43	44	30	57	67						
BLK	64	42		89	88		69				
HSP	61	50	37	67	61	67	71				
MUL	81	48		78	70						
WHT	69	56	45	78	70	63	66	82	35		
FRL	61	46	32	68	67	64	67		43		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	38	46	53	44	50	50	33				
BLK	85	63		64	72						
HSP	67	57	43	68	76	75	59	92			
MUL	79	54		74	42						
WHT	73	58	51	71	74	71	66	81	45		
FRL	72	60	60	63	68	80	60	88			

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

For the data presented, our ELA scores for the lowest 25 percentile were the lowest in our data profile. This group's data dropped eight percentage points from the year before. We believe there are a few contributing factors- our fourth grade had a high percentage of ESE students that moved up from third grade. This, coupled with addition of writing to FSA posed some challenges. In addition, we had an influx of new to PCCA scholars in grades 7-9. Also, our sixth graders received ELA instruction in a middle school period that was the same length as other periods.

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

For the data presented, our 6th grade ELA scores showed the greatest decline. We can attribute this to couple of reasons. Sixth graders received ELA instruction in a middle school schedule, with 50 minute periods. In another setting, they would have still received 90 minutes of ELA instruction daily. This change in time could impacted their performance. In addition, this group was taught by teacher that had many years of teaching experience, but this was her first year teaching at PCCA. Moving to a new curriculum and instructional method involves an adjustment period for any teacher.

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

For the data presented, we only had one data point that was below the state average. Sixth grade scholars performed 1% less than the state. The factors impacting this are described above.

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

For the data presented, our fourth grade math scores showed the greatest improvement for the cohort. These scholars performed very poorly as a third grade group, with only 49% scoring proficiently. We recognized this need, and worked to provide extensive support to our fourth grade math classes. These classes are already grouped by ability, so our Guidance Counselor pushed into our lowest math class, providing daily support. In addition, we conducted diagnostic fluency probes to determine needs for computation practice. These probes determined that scholars needed additional Tier 2 support in addition and subtraction with multiple digits. Once this was practiced, we moved on to division.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our biggest area of concern is the amount of students in seventh and eighth grade scoring a Level 1 on the Reading or Math FSA. When analyzing the data further, it can be seen that 62% of seventh graders and 53% of eighth graders are new to PCCA for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

1. Math performance in grades K-11
2. Ensuring engagement and achievement for virtual scholars
3. Matriculation of high school students to post-secondary options
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

While 2018-2019 FSA shows a need for improvement in ELA scores across grade levels. However, our initial observations, diagnostic testing, and MAP scores in the 2020-2021 school year reveal a significant need for math remediation and intervention. The move to distance learning in the Spring of 2020 created a significant gap in math knowledge and practice for our K-11 student population. Fifty percent of our grade levels (3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11) have 21% or more of scholars ranking in the Low Average or Average ranges. Third grade has the greatest amount of struggling scholars, with 32% of students falling in these ranges. Further exploration of MAP data shows specific deficiencies and percentages of those in the Low range in the following grade levels:

First Grade- Geometry, Statistics and Probability (17%)
 Second Grade- Geometry, Measurement and Data (12%)
 Third Grade- Operations and Algebraic Thinking, Geometry (32%)
 Fourth Grade- Geometry, Measurement and Data (25%)
 Fifth Grade- Geometry, Operations and Algebraic Thinking (20%)
 Sixth Grade- Statistics and Probability, Geometry (19%)
 Seventh Grade- Geometry, Statistics and Probability (29%)
 Eighth Grade- Geometry, Statistics and Probability (24%)
 Ninth Grade- Geometry, Statistics and Probability (26%)
 Tenth Grade- Statistics and Probability, Geometry (16%)
 Eleventh Grade- Operations and Algebraic Thinking, Statistics and Probability (24%)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The data shows a trend of Geometry being a need in most grade levels. This makes sense since this was a topic traditionally addressed in the final quarter (when students were home). These needs will need to be addressed throughout Tier One instruction. Scholars receiving ESE services and those in Tiered interventions will need to receive additional instruction with these standards.

The introduction of Innovative learning adds to these concerns. For example, in third grade (our highest level of struggling students) also has the second highest number of students participating in virtual instruction.

Measureable Outcome: By May 2020, scholars in grades 3-11 will meet or exceed district averages on the FSA for Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: This year we will working to improve mathematical problem solving. Our teachers and scholars will review steps necessary for problem solving, including manipulative use and bar modeling. Through problem solving practice, scholars will be able to practice the skills included in geometry, algebraic thinking, and probability and statistics.

Rationale for Evidence- The Florida Standard for Mathematics requires students to not only know facts, but to be able to explain and demonstrate knowledge of mathematical practices. The repeated practice of problem solving will require students to practice both of these simultaneously.

**based
Strategy:**

Action Steps to Implement

Tiered instruction needs to include standards based instruction to remediate the skills of geometry, algebraic thinking, and statistics and probability. In addition to teachers supporting these topics in Tier One instruction, we have hired a Math Interventionist to support struggling students across grades K-11. This instructional interventionist will help to support classroom instruction, as well as Tier 2 and Tier 3 needs. In addition, she will support our third grade scholars, as they prepare to take FSA for the first time.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

We have implemented the use of MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) for all of 1-11 scholars. The data from this assessment will help guide teachers and our interventionist in providing targeted instruction and support for those needing remediation.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our data shows that significant academic improvements are needed, however, the 202-2021 school year poses many considerations in regards to student engagement. Our scholars and families have all been exposed to the use of Google Classroom in the event of unexpected quarantine or closure. Teachers and scholars involved in virtual or hybrid instruction/learning are using new software and hardware on a daily basis. In order for this to flow smoothly, extensive training for both parties is necessary. Approximately 30% of our scholars are participating in virtual instruction. Specific participation is listed below:
 Kindergarten- 13%
 First Grade- 26%
 Second Grade- 25%
 Third Grade- 35%
 Fourth Grade- 32%
 Fifth Grade- 34%
 Sixth Grade- 41%
 Seventh Grade- 31%
 Eighth Grade- 34%
 Ninth Grade- 28%
 Tenth Grade- 26%
 Eleventh Grade- 31%
 This amount of scholars learning from home (not including large groups that have had to quarantine due to exposure) shows the need for assurance of proper engagement from all parties involved. Innovative learning requires great independence and motivation from those at home- both scholars and families. Adults at home need to be well aware of expectations and student performance. Communication between home and school will be essential to make this work successfully.

Measureable Outcome: By May of 2021, 90% of virtual learners will regularly attend class, submit assignments, engage in class discussion, and maintain a grade of C or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The data shows that our 3-6 teachers, scholars, and families do not have experience using Google Classroom, Google Meet, or other online platforms for instruction and learning. Our scholars in grades 7-11 used Google Classroom in the Spring, but did not engage with live instruction. This platform will require that scholars and families are fluent in the program, including the submission of assignments, engagement in the classroom with chat and microphones, and tracking grades.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers were provided extensive training for Google Classroom use during preplanning. Initial training took place in a virtual setting and small group follow ups were available for anyone interested. In addition, training documents and videos were created for teachers,

scholars, and parents. These resources are posted in Google Classroom and on our school website. These have proved to be valuable for those that have selected this method of learning, as well as those needing it while in quarantine.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Teachers were provided demonstrations of technology use and set up in classrooms. Webcams and additional document cameras were purchased.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Jr/Sr grade levels have a high concentration of students with disabilities and the data shows that they are struggling to meet expectations in Reading and Math. In grades 7-11, 18.5% of our population has an IEP with a primary disability of ASD, Other Health Impaired, Specific Learning Disability, and/or Language.
 Reading- 65% earned score of 1 or 2 on 2018-2019 FSA, 17% do not have FSA scores
 Math- 48% earned score of 1 or 2 on 2018-2019 FSA , 24% do not have FSA scores

Measurable Outcome: By May of 2021, 90% of our students with disabilities will show learning gains on the reading and math assessments for their grade level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our students with disabilities are served by an excellent team of teachers that provide a variety of support. Through Learning Strategies classes and push in support, scholars receive help needed through Extended Practice and Application of Skills/Concepts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our students with disabilities often struggle with the mastery of content and need repeated exposures to feel comfortable with understanding. By giving extended practice and application of skills/concepts, our teachers provide scholars with additional teaching of the original content shared by classroom teachers, allowing for a stronger understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

A Learning Strategies class will be provided to middle and high school scholars struggling with academics and organization. This class will provide additional instruction, as well as time for scholars to ensure understanding of task demands and expectations.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheeler (wheelerl@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

In addition to improving math performance and student engagement, we also have our first group of 11th graders this year. The final high school years provide much opportunity for preparation for post-secondary choices. In order to best prepare our scholars for the necessary testing, AP and Dual Enrollment, and post-secondary plans, we have hired an Academic Advisor. This advisor will work closely with our scholars, staff, and families to ensure smooth transitions for all. She will work closely with our faculty and scholars to prepare and raise awareness of College Board test expectations. In addition, she will liaise with EFSC and the College Board to maintain compliance with AP and Dual Enrollment requirements. Meetings and information sessions (in-person and virtual) will make all comfortable with the college/vocational school admissions process.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

A positive school environment is essential for the success of all. As a school, we believe that all stakeholders- teachers, scholars, and families must feel confident and proud to be affiliated with our school. When teachers and other staff members feel respected and appreciated, they are eager to come to school and put forth their best effort in creating a learning environment that is welcoming, risk free, and challenging. When scholars feel respected and cared for, they are eager to please their teachers and work toward meeting personal goals of achievement. When families feel safe and comfortable bringing their children to our school, they help our mission and teaching staff through communication and home support. In addition to our everyday stakeholders, we appreciate the input and support of our community. Our Governing Board meets quarterly to discuss pertinent school issues and budgetary topics. The Board consists of parents that are mission-focused and appreciate the goals of classical education. In addition, we are quite supported by the efforts of our local police department. This department visits our school regularly to conduct critical incident drills and function as our School Resource Officer. These officers work as mentors to our scholars and support our efforts to fortify school safety. While this year may look a little different, our PTO works tirelessly to uplift our staff and provide support wherever needed. Our parents regularly volunteer in our car loop, classrooms, cafeteria, and at school events. Their organization and planning of school events such as our Book Fair, family events, and fundraisers helps bring our families together in a fun and casual way. Relationships formed between families and scholars at these

events are integral to our community. Our teachers and staff so appreciate the love and assistance provided by our parent volunteers.

As our school population ages, we will work to develop relationships with local schools. We are currently working with EFSC to provide Dual Enrollment opportunities for our 11th graders. Our Academic Advisor is working to build relationships with state colleges and universities, admissions offices, and the College Board. This growth will ensure our future graduates a smooth transition to secondary educational choices and opportunities.

This school year brings about particular concerns for social/emotional learning for all of our scholars and families. In-person scholars are facing incredible challenges with many changes to the school environment and procedures. Our virtual scholars are learning a new educational platform and juggling many expectations for independence. These challenges come in addition to the anxiety and possible depression brought on by the last 6-7 months at home.

Our school counselor is working closely with those in need of counseling and check ins.

Frequent conversations with parents, scholars, in addition, to referrals to counseling agencies if needed, will keep our school counselor busy this year!

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$52,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	6543 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy	General Fund		\$42,000.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for Math Interventionist</i>			
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	6543 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy	General Fund		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: MAP software for testing</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$3,766.92
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	6543 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy	General Fund		\$3,766.92
			<i>Notes: Purchase of webcams and document cameras for classrooms</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
					Total:	\$55,766.92