

Brevard Public Schools

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy At West



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy At West Melbourne

3455 NORFOLK PKWY, West Melbourne, FL 32904

www.pineapplecoveclassicalacademywm.com

Demographics

Principal: Ashley Cook

Start Date for this Principal: 5/8/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: 2016-17: 2015-16: 2014-15: 2013-14:
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 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 a unique option for families providing students with a K-7 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 2019

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

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 how to support student needs, and serves on the school Attendance Committee.

Cook, Ashley

Principal

In addition to the duties listed above, the principal is also responsible for the hiring and evaluation of teachers and staff. The principal is responsible for ensuring the safety and security of the school, including the Threat Assessment Team. The principal is also responsible for overseeing the maintenance and upkeep of the grounds and facilities, reporting to and communicating with the school's governing board of directors and Hillsdale College, and maintaining compliance with district and authorizer compliance. The principal evaluates the professional development needs of school and implements necessary training.

Koblitz, Paris

Assistant Principal

In addition to the job duties listed above, the Assistant Principal is the testing coordinator for all grade levels within the school. She also serves as the organizer of all extracurricular activities, including clubs and tutoring. She provides support to the principal for teacher evaluations. The Assistant Principal is responsible for the creation and implementation of the school-wide and student schedules.

Forsythe, Denise

Other

In addition to the responsibilities of the School Leadership Team, Mrs. Forsythe, the Student Services Coordinator, serves as the ESOL Contact and as an interventionist. She is also the mentor for all new teachers and coaches new teachers on the policies and procedures of our school. This includes day-to-day operations as well as instructional practices.

Gunter, Kelly

Other

Mrs. Gunter serves as the Director of Schools. In addition to the responsibilities of the School Leadership Team, Mrs. Gunter manages the school budget, advises on school finances, and guides teachers and ensures compliance with teacher certification. She is responsible for the management of Charter Tools to ensure compliance with Office of EIC.

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	87	91	73	85	64	65	60	0	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	2	2	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	7	1	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	7	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on FSA Math	0	0	0	0	6	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	6	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Students with two or more indicators	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	73%	65%	61%	0%	68%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	58%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	54%	54%	0%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	67%	62%	0%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	62%	59%	0%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	59%	52%	0%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	68%	62%	56%	0%	63%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	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	
Number of students enrolled	72 (0)	87 (0)	91 (0)	73 (0)	85 (0)	64 (0)	65 (0)	60 (0)	0 (0)	597 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	4 ()	2 ()	2 ()	1 ()	3 ()	0 ()	2 ()	0 ()	15 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	5 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	14 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 ()	7 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	20 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	18 (0)
Level 1 on FSA Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	6 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	76%	64%	12%	58%	18%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	61%	2%	58%	5%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		63%				
05	2019	81%	60%	21%	56%	25%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		81%				
06	2019	71%	60%	11%	54%	17%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		71%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	64%	-8%	64%	-8%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		56%				
05	2019	69%	60%	9%	60%	9%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		69%				
06	2019	67%	67%	0%	55%	12%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		67%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	56%	10%	53%	13%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
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	57			43							
BLK	78	80		47	40						
HSP	59	52		55	33						
MUL	82			50							
WHT	74	62	69	61	50	50	68				
FRL	58	57	64	45	20	33					

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

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	
--------------------------------	--

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	61
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	50
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	66
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	62
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	46
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

Overall, our Math Learning Gains showed the lowest performance. Specifically, third grade math had the lowest performance when compared to the district and state.

As a brand new school, we accepted students from a variety of public, private, and home school settings. Students came to us with a varying degree of math exposure. In addition, for the majority of our teachers, the 2018-2019 school year was the first year they taught math using the Singapore curriculum. As such, many teachers had not mastered the curriculum and were learning how to best implement the math curriculum and align it with Florida State Standards during our first year. In addition, students are not retained based on math scores. As a result, students who are strong in ELA but weak in mathematics may be promoted and could be one or two grade levels behind in math.

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

The school opened in 2018-2019, therefore we do not have data from the prior 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

Third grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The third grade math scores were 12% below the state. As a second year school, we do not yet have any trends to analyze. However, the factors that contributed to this gap are similar to the factors contributing to the lowest performance.

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

The school opened in 2018-2019, therefore we do not have data from the prior year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The Early Warning Systems data indicate there are 32 students who have scored a level 1 on FSA ELA and/or mathematics. This data is concerning as it represents 12% of our students in grades 4th-7th.

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

1. Third Grade Math
2. Low Performing Students
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Third Grade Math Scores
Rationale	Third grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The third grade math scores were 12% below the state.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

PCCA West Melbourne plans to increase third grade math scores within five percentage points of the district average.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Ashley Cook (cooka@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy

Improving Mathematical Problem Solving

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

We believe the cause of low performance on Math FSA is related to teacher familiarity with the Singapore Math Curriculum as well as properly identifying students who are struggling with mathematical problem solving.

Action Step

Description

1. Math Coach: Over the summer, a math coach was hired to directly support teachers in the mastery of the Singapore math curriculum as well as to provide interventions for students who are struggling in math. The math coach will provide support for teaching Florida State Standards using the Singapore Math Curriculum.
2. Professional Development: Teachers will receive professional development related to the Singapore Mathematics Curriculum from Hillsdale College.
3. Math Manipulatives: Additional math manipulatives will be purchased for student and teacher use.
4. Online Gradebook/Communication Tool: Enhanced use of ThinkWave to inform parents of progress in mathematics.

Person Responsible

Ashley Cook (cooka@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

#2

Title Level 1 FSA Scores
Rationale After reviewing the data, we discovered 12% of students in testing grade levels received a 1 on FSA in English Language Arts and/or Mathematics. We will need to work closely as a leadership team to monitor their progress.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve By May of 2020, 95% of our students in grades 4 through 7 will earn a 2 or above on FSA ELA and Mathematics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Ashley Cook (cooka@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy Using Student Achievement Data To Support Instructional Decision Making

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy We believe the problem is occurring because the students who have earned low scores on FSA have not previously been properly identified as struggling students in their prior schools. We hope that enrollment in a smaller school with better opportunities for relationships with teachers and staff members will improve performance on standardized assessments.

Action Step

Description

1. MTSS/IPST: Students will be referred to the MTSS team more quickly this year now that we know our students better as a second year school. In addition, we will increase parent communication to keep them informed of how the student is receiving intervention to support.
2. Intervention Groups: Students will be placed in intervention groups during SMART block (Supplemental Math and Reading Time) to receive additional support. As needed, students will be placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups.
3. Professional Development: The school will provide opportunities for teachers to develop understanding in how to utilize Performance Matters to disaggregate the FSA data to determine which areas on the standardized assessments students are struggling with the most. The teachers will then be instructed on what to do with that data to support students once the areas are identified.

Person Responsible Ashley Cook (cooka@pineapplecoveclassicalacademy.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Results of the Florida Safe Schools Assessment showed a need for upgrades to the facility, including additional fencing, to support the safety measures currently being implemented

by the Threat Assessment Team. The school will improve signage on the interior and exterior of the building related to safety and security.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy at West Melbourne is not a Title I School.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy at West Melbourne is not a Title I School.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy at West Melbourne is not a Title I School.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy at West Melbourne is not a Title I School.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Pineapple Cove Classical Academy at West Melbourne is not a Title I School.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Third Grade Math Scores				\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

			6554 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy W Melbourne			\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Additional math manipulatives were purchased to support teacher instruction in the classroom for teachers and students.</i>			
			6554 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy W Melbourne			\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Mathematics Coach hired by Classical Education Management Company</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Level 1 FSA Scores				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		262500-TRAVEL - OUT OF STATE - AIRFARE	6554 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy W Melbourne	General Fund		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Teachers will receive training from Hillsdale College faculty and staff related to the implementation of the Singapore Mathematics curriculum.</i>			
			6554 - Pineapple Cove Classical Academy W Melbourne	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Classical Education Management Company has provided Literacy and Mathematics coaches to support the school.</i>			
					Total:	\$12,500.00