The School District of Palm Beach County

K. E. Cunningham/Canal Point Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| | |
| School Information | 6 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| | |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

K. E. Cunningham/Canal Point Elementary

37000 MAIN ST, Canal Point, FL 33438

https://kece.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Derrick Hibler

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2012

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (42%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F | or more information, click here. |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach County School Board.

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:

- 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.

Table of Contents

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | |
| School Information | 6 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| | |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Last Modified: 5/20/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 28

K. E. Cunningham/Canal Point Elementary

37000 MAIN ST, Canal Point, FL 33438

https://kece.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

| School Type and G (per MSID | | 2021-22 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | E Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | School | Yes | | 100% | | | |
| Primary Servi (per MSID | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) | | | |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 96% | | | |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | | | | |
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | | | |
| Grade | С | | В | В | | | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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 KE Cunningham Canal Point Elementary School is to educate, affirm, and inspire each student in an equity-embedded school system.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"We envision...KE Cunningham Canal Point Elementary School is an educational and working environment, where both students and staff are unimpeded by bias or discrimination. Individuals of all backgrounds and experiences are embraced, affirmed, and inspired. Each and every one will succeed and flourish. A joy of learning is fostered in each student and a positive vision for their future is nurtured. Each student's cultural heritage is valued and their physical, emotional, academic, and social needs are met.."

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Hibler, Derrick | Principal | Instructional Leader of the school. |
| Henley, Altoria | Assistant Principal | Assist the Principal of the school. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/9/2012, Derrick Hibler

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

248

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 42 | 25 | 52 | 36 | 38 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 27 | 18 | 20 | 27 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 6 | 16 | 20 | 26 | 25 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | | | | | G | rade | Le | vel | l | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|----|----|----|----|------|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 16 | 15 | 26 | 26 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/9/2022

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 24 | 44 | 30 | 47 | 46 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 28 | 15 | 15 | 22 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 16 | 17 | 25 | 32 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 6 | 15 | 21 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 32 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 18 | 15 | 17 | 39 | 29 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| FY21 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| FY21 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 14 | 16 | 20 | 29 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 24 | 44 | 30 | 47 | 46 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 28 | 15 | 15 | 22 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 16 | 17 | 25 | 32 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 6 | 15 | 21 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 32 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 18 | 15 | 17 | 39 | 29 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| FY21 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| FY21 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 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 | | | | | G | rade | Le | ve | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|--|----|----|----|----|------|----|----|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | | 14 | 16 | 20 | 29 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| lu dia stan | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Tatal |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Students retained two or more times | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | 36% | 59% | 56% | | | | 44% | 58% | 57% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 42% | | | | | | 60% | 63% | 58% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | | | | | | 69% | 56% | 53% | |
| Math Achievement | 31% | 53% | 50% | | | | 52% | 68% | 63% | |
| Math Learning Gains | 66% | | | | | | 70% | 68% | 62% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 57% | | · | | | | 68% | 59% | 51% | |

| School Grade Component | | 2022 | 2021 20 | | | | 2019 | 2019 | |
|------------------------|--------|----------|---------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement | 11% | 59% | 59% | | | | 40% | 51% | 53% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 54% | -16% | 58% | -20% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 62% | -13% | 58% | -9% |
| Cohort Cor | Cohort Comparison | | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 59% | -22% | 56% | -19% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -49% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | Cohort Comparison | | · | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 65% | -20% | 62% | -17% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 67% | -25% | 64% | -22% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -45% | | | ' | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 65% | -2% | 60% | 3% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -42% | | | <u>'</u> | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 51% | -16% | 53% | -18% |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | • | |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2022 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 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 | |
| SWD | 21 | 40 | 50 | 20 | 50 | 60 | 20 | | | | | |
| ELL | 57 | 64 | | 50 | 92 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 35 | 48 | 23 | 60 | 55 | 8 | | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 69 | | 56 | 93 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 42 | 50 | 31 | 66 | 57 | 11 | | | | | |
| | 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | |
| SWD | 29 | 57 | 45 | 9 | 29 | 50 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 60 | | 24 | 30 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 63 | 60 | 19 | 25 | 31 | 7 | | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 57 | | 30 | 36 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 62 | 53 | 23 | 29 | 38 | 5 | | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | |
| SWD | 24 | 51 | 72 | 47 | 76 | 72 | 39 | | | | | |
| ELL | 48 | 83 | | 48 | 78 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 55 | 64 | 50 | 66 | 67 | 30 | | | | | |
| HSP | 55 | 81 | | 58 | 81 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 60 | 69 | 52 | 70 | 68 | 40 | | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 45 | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO | | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 63 | | | | | | | |

| FOOA Feelens Heelens | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Federal Index | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 356 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 37 |
| 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 | 65 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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 |
| 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 | 37 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 69 |
| 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 | |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

As we analyzed our Subgroup report provided by the FDOE, we noticed that our Black students and SWD students performed below 41% of the state ESSA Points category. Both subgroups performed at 37% during the FY22 FSA administration. According to the FSA administration, the Black students performed at 29% proficiency, and at 23% proficiency in math. The SWD students performed at 21% proficiency in ELA, and at 20% proficiency in math. Our Hispanic students performed at 57% proficiency in ELA, and at 56% proficiency in math. Our ELL students performed at 57% in ELA, and at 50% proficiency in math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

According to our FSA data FY22, we noticed our ELA decreased (-8%) from 44% FY21 to 36% proficiency in FY22. We also noticed that we had a decrease in ELA Learning Gains (-20%) from 62% FY21 to 42% in FY22. We also noticed that we had a decrease in our Low 25 Learning Gains (-3%) from 53% FY21 to 50% FY22.

According to our i-Ready ELA and Math data by grade level in FY22, the following occurred:

Grade 3 - ELA 42% proficient compared to the district at 54% and the state at 54% proficiency. Grade 3 - Math - our students performed at 32% proficiency compared to the district at 58% and the state at 58% proficiency.

Grade 4 - ELA 33% proficient compared to the district at 62% and the state at 57% proficiency. Grade 4 - Math - our students performed at 40% proficiency compared to the district at 59% and the state at 61% proficiency.

Grade 5 - ELA 28% proficient compared to the district at 57% and the state at 55% proficiency. Grade 3 - Math - our students performed at 15% proficiency compared to the district at 44% and the state at 48% proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Looking at the above data, we see that our 5th grade students in both ELA & Math had a significant decrease in proficiency compared to grades 3 & 4. Attendance was a huge issue with our 5th grade students. Also, the math teacher in 5th grade missed a good portion August to October) of the school year for being out of school on paternity leave. For the ELA 5th grade teacher, she was new to teaching this grade level coming from grade 2 to grade 5 in FY22.

Considering that 69% of our students need substantial support for the next grade level, we have put in place back-to-school activities focused on meeting and overcoming learning loss. With our in class tests and other assessments being administered throughout this school year, we are including question types and standards aligned with the F.A.S.T. blueprint. We also noticed that 66% of our students didn't meet the standards in ELA. Therefore, we have increased weekly and writing activities for our students. We are also implementing weekly Eath and ELA practices that are repetitive for the students throughout the week. We also have daily bell ringers focusing on State assessment prep (Question type, Rigor, etc.) in all classes.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Comparing our FSA data from FY21 to FY22, we noticed improvements in the following areas:

We made learning gains in math proficiency (8%) from 23 % FY22 to 31% FY23. We made improvements in science (6%) from 5% FY22 to 11% FY23. We made improvements in math learning gains (37%) from 29% FY21 to 66% FY22. We made improvements in our Low 25% math learning gains (19%) from 38% FY21 to 57% FY22.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our small groups made a positive impact for these students. We also provided after-school tutoring for our students who showed performance levels of Level 1 or 2 in reading and/or math. We used ESSER and Title I funds to pay our teachers and academic tutors to work after school with our students. We also had data chats with our students and parents to make them aware of their performance levels and we provided tips on how they could improve their learning in reading and math.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

After reviewing our data with our students and teachers, we aligned our expectations in our School-wide Improvement Plan. By doing this, we are holding both students and teachers accountable at school, and our parents from providing them our PMP plans for their child.

Students:

Students will demonstrate increased mastery of content

Students utilize content specific vocabulary during discussions in class

Students question themselves and each other to deepen understanding

Students provide one another with high quality academic feedback aligned to learning targets Students self-reflect

Teachers:

Teachers plan effectively daily and weekly showing they are meeting the needs of all students each day (tracking and monitoring student learning)

Teachers utilize Marzano Taxonomy Question Stems, Products, Terms and Phrases chart for academic conversations with students

Teachers provide feedback aligned to learning targets and on student discourse

Teachers facilitate and encourage academic conversations

Teachers reflect on the impact of academic conversation on student learning

Teachers will provide manipulatives for all math students to use during instruction

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

All teachers participate in weekly PLC's and attend weekly cadres in their content areas after school throughout each week. All teachers have a coach and mentor to work with throughout each day as needed. Teachers are provided opportunities to do learning walks with the Principal, and visit other teacher's classrooms as needed.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

This year, we as a school have agreed to focus on the same PGP target which is based on planning. Both teachers and administrators are looking at the implementation and planning steps in the Marzano tool and coaching practices are being implemented this school year to help provide a school-wide practice trying to resolve a school-wide concern.

We are doing weekly learning walks with coaches and administrators. We are providing explicit feedback to all teachers as we visit classrooms (positive and needs of improvements).

We are also using the support staff from the Glades Region and District Staff to come and do PD with teachers and model in classrooms throughout the school year as needed.

As an early intervention to increase student readiness to enter kindergarten, KE Cunningham Canal Point Elementary School offers a school year Migrant Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Program supplemented with enrichment hours and/or a PreK self-contained program for students ages 3 to 5 determined eligible for exceptional student education based on goals and services as written on the Individual Education Plan.) This Migrant VPK program(s) is supported by the School District of Palm Beach County Department of Early Childhood Education and/or Department of Exceptional Student Education) and follows all Florida statutes, rules, and contractual mandates, including the use of a developmentally appropriate curriculum that enhances the age-appropriate progress of children in attaining each of the Florida Early Learning performance standards. Participating children are expected to transition to kindergarten ready to learn and be successful in school.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

-

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of

Focus

Description

and

Rationale:

Include a

rationale that According to the FSA administration, the Black students performed at 29% proficiency, **explains how** and at 23% proficiency in math.

it was identified as a critical need from the data

Measurable

Outcome:

reviewed.

State the specific

measurable

outcome the

school plans to achieve.

This should

be a data based,

objective

outcome.

Monitoring:

Describe how this

Area of

Focus will be monitored

for the desired

outcome. Person

responsible

for

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-Students:

based Students will demonstrate increased mastery of content

Strategy: Describe the Students utilize content specific vocabulary during discussions in class Students question themselves and each other to deepen understanding

Students provide one another with high quality academic feedback aligned to learning evidencebased

strategy being

implemented Teachers:

Students self-reflect

subgroup African American students, will receive learning gains from grade 3 (retained students) and 4th and 5th grade students.

By May 2023, 70% of our students of our ELA/Math courses, including ESSA identified

Considering that 69% of our students need substantial support for the next grade level. we have put in place back-to-school activities focused on meeting and overcoming learning loss. With our in class tests and other assessments being administered throughout this school year, we are including question types and standards aligned with the F.A.S.T. blueprint. We also noticed that 66% of our students didn't meet the standards in ELA. Therefore, we have increased weekly and writing activities for our students. We are also implementing weekly Math and ELA practices that are repetitive for the students throughout the week. We also have daily bell ringers focusing on State assessment prep

Derrick Hibler (derrick.hibler@palmbeachschools.org)

(Question type, Rigor, etc.) in all classes.

Teachers plan effectively daily and weekly showing they are meeting the needs of all

students each day (tracking and monitoring student learning)

Teachers utilize Marzano Taxonomy Question Stems, Products, Terms and Phrases chart

for this Area

for academic conversations with students

of Focus. Teachers provide feedback aligned to learning targets and on student discourse

Teachers facilitate and encourage academic conversations

Teachers reflect on the impact of academic conversation on student learning Teachers will provide manipulatives for all math students to use during instruction

Rationale for

Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this This year, our school staff agreed to focus on the same PGP target which is based on planning. Both teachers and administrators are looking at the implementation and planning steps in the Marzano tool and coaching practices are being implemented this school year to help provide a school-wide practice trying to resolve a school-wide

concern.

selecting this

specific strategy.

We are doing weekly learning walks with coaches and administrators. We are providing

explicit feedback to all teachers as we visit classrooms (positive and needs of

Describe the improvements).

resources/

criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We are also using the support staff from the Glades Region and District Staff to come and do PD with teachers and model in classrooms throughout the school year as needed.

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.

Plan when to monitor during each 'chunk' of the lesson

Plan techniques for monitoring

Use techniques to monitor for the desired result

Vary monitoring techniques throughout the lesson

Check technique for correct execution

Become aware of differential expectations for students

Take stock of differential treatment of students

Identify specific students to target that have been treated differently

Identify student needs for consideration

Plan a technique for positive interactions with targeted students

Plan to reinforce necessary conative skills

Use a technique to communicate high expectations to targeted students

Check technique for correct execution

Consciously and systematically use behaviors that demonstrate value and respect for targeted students

Provide students with strategies to avoid negative thinking

Address every students' question as much as possible

Systematically ask targeted students challenging questions that require conclusions

Devote as much time with incorrect answers for targeted students as with other students

Person

Responsible

Derrick Hibler (derrick.hibler@palmbeachschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of

Focus

Description

and

Rationale:

Include a

rationale that According to the FSA administration, the Students with Disabilities performed at 21% **explains how** proficiency in ELA, and at 20% proficiency in math.

it was identified as a critical need from the data

Measurable Outcome:

reviewed.

State the specific

measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based,

objective outcome. By May 2023, 70% of our students of our ELA/Math courses, including ESSA identified subgroup Students with Disabilities, will receive learning gains from grade 3 (retained students) and 4th and 5th grade students.

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

Considering that 69% of our students need substantial support for the next grade level, we have put in place back-to-school activities focused on meeting and overcoming learning loss. With our in class tests and other assessments being administered throughout this school year, we are including question types and standards aligned with the F.A.S.T. blueprint. We also noticed that 66% of our students didn't meet the standards in ELA. Therefore, we have increased weekly and writing activities for our students. We are also implementing weekly Math and ELA practices that are repetitive for the students throughout the week. We also have daily bell ringers focusing on State assessment prep (Question type, Rigor, etc.) in all classes.

Person responsible for

Derrick Hibler (derrick.hibler@palmbeachschools.org)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-Students:

based Students will demonstrate increased mastery of content

Students utilize content specific vocabulary during discussions in class Strategy: Students question themselves and each other to deepen understanding Describe the

evidencebased targets

Students provide one another with high quality academic feedback aligned to learning

Students self-reflect strategy

being

Teachers:

Teachers plan effectively daily and weekly showing they are meeting the needs of all

students each day (tracking and monitoring student learning)

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers utilize Marzano Taxonomy Question Stems, Products, Terms and Phrases chart

for academic conversations with students

Teachers provide feedback aligned to learning targets and on student discourse

Teachers facilitate and encourage academic conversations

Teachers reflect on the impact of academic conversation on student learning Teachers will provide manipulatives for all math students to use during instruction

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/

criteria used

for selecting this strategy.

This year, our school staff agreed to focus on the same PGP target which is based on planning. Both teachers and administrators are looking at the implementation and planning steps in the Marzano tool and coaching practices are being implemented this school year to help provide a school-wide practice trying to resolve a school-wide concern.

We are doing weekly learning walks with coaches and administrators. We are providing explicit feedback to all teachers as we visit classrooms (positive and needs of improvements).

We are also using the support staff from the Glades Region and District Staff to come and do PD with teachers and model in classrooms throughout the school year as needed.

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.

Plan when to monitor during each 'chunk' of the lesson

Plan techniques for monitoring

Use techniques to monitor for the desired result

Vary monitoring techniques throughout the lesson

Check technique for correct execution

Become aware of differential expectations for students

Take stock of differential treatment of students

Identify specific students to target that have been treated differently

Identify student needs for consideration

Plan a technique for positive interactions with targeted students

Plan to reinforce necessary conative skills

Use a technique to communicate high expectations to targeted students

Check technique for correct execution

Consciously and systematically use behaviors that demonstrate value and respect for targeted students

Provide students with strategies to avoid negative thinking

Address every students' question as much as possible

Systematically ask targeted students challenging questions that require conclusions

Devote as much time with incorrect answers for targeted students as with other students

Person Responsible

Derrick Hibler (derrick.hibler@palmbeachschools.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
 Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Due to the Pandemic, K-2 teachers did not conduct any RRR data from FY19 to FY22. Therefore, the only data we have for K-2 is i-Ready data.

The results of our i-Ready Reading shows the following student data for FY21 to FY22 for the Percent of Lessons Passed & Time-on-Task:

Grade K - 66% Average Lessons Passed; 23% performing (0-49%); 36% performing (50-69%); and 41% performing (70-100%)

Grade 1 - 86% Average Lessons Passed; 4% performing (0-49%); 13% performing (50-69%); and 83% performing (70-100%)

Grade 2 - 89% Average Lessons Passed; 6% performing (0-49%); 0% performing (50-69%); and 94% performing (70-100%)

Results of our i-Ready Reading by grade level Grade K Window 3 Mid or above Grade Level 65% Early on Grade Level 27% One Grade Level Below 8% Two Grade Levels Below 0% Three or More Grade Levels Below 0%

Grade K Window 1 Mid or above Grade Level 0% Early on Grade Level 8% One Grade Level Below 92% Two Grade Levels Below 0% Three or More Grade Levels Below 0%

Grade1 Window 3 Mid or above Grade Level 29% Early on Grade Level 13%

One Grade Level Below 57% Two Grade Levels Below 2% Three or More Grade Levels Below 0%

Grade 1 Window 1 Mid or above Grade Level 8% Early on Grade Level 5%
One Grade Level Below 78%
Two Grade Levels Below 10%
Three or More Grade Levels Below 0%

Grade 2 Window 3 Mid or above Grade Level 9% Early on Grade Level 13% One Grade Level Below 43% Two Grade Levels Below 35% Three or More Grade Levels Below 0%

Grade 2 Window 1 Mid or above Grade Level 2% Early on Grade Level 7% One Grade Level Below 33% Two Grade Levels Below 59% Three or More Grade Levels Below 0%

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to the FSA ELA Achievement Data from FY22, our data shows the following: Grade 3 - FY19 - 37.7%, FY21 - 32,7%, and FY22 - 42.2% proficiency. Grade 4 - FY19 - 48.4%, FY21 - 39.1%, and FY22 - 33.3% proficiency. Grade 5 - FY19 - 37.2%, FY21 - 51.7%, and FY22 - 27.2% proficiency.

For 4th grade, proficiency declined from FY19 to FY22 by 15.5% in proficiency. For 5th grade, from FY21 to FY22, the proficiency declined by 24% in proficiency. This data shows that our 4th and 5th grade students are critical grade levels that needs support.

Results of our i-Ready Reading by grade level Grade 3 Window 3 Mid or above Grade Level 17% Early on Grade Level 21% One Grade Level Below 17% Two Grade Levels Below 28% Three or More Grade Levels Below 16%

Grade 3 Window 1 Mid or above Grade Level 1% Early on Grade Level 13% One Grade Level Below 17% Two Grade Levels Below 40% Three or More Grade Levels Below 28%

Grade 4 Window 3 Mid or above Grade Level 17% Early on Grade Level 13% One Grade Level Below 47% Two Grade Levels Below 9% Three or More Grade Levels Below 15%

Grade 4 Window 1 Mid or above Grade Level 4%

Early on Grade Level 17%
One Grade Level Below 43%
Two Grade Levels Below 13%
Three or More Grade Levels Below 23%

Grade 5 Window 3 Mid or above Grade Level 4% Early on Grade Level 15%
One Grade Level Below 35%
Two Grade Levels Below 27%
Three or More Grade Levels Below 19%

Grade 5 Window 1 Mid or above Grade Level 0% Early on Grade Level 10% One Grade Level Below 21% Two Grade Levels Below 42% Three or More Grade Levels Below 27%

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

In FY23, 95% of our Kindergarten students, 50% of our 1st grade students, and 35% of our 2nd grade students will receive proficiency after taking the Window 3 Diagnostics in i-Ready Reading.

Currently, Grade K shows 92% proficiency in reading. Grade 1 shows 42% proficiency in reading.

Grade 2 shows 22% proficiency in reading.

With the new Benchmark Curriculum in place with Grades K-2, we are focusing on the following instructional practices for reading:

Focus on meaning

Read aloud

Getting students to br independent readers

Give beginning readers lots of opportunities to interact with print material

Provide opportunities for success

Teach phonics

Building Vocabulary

Developing question stems for partner talk and small group conversations

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In FY23, 45% of our 3rd grade students, 45% of our 4th grade students, and 30% of our 5th grade students will receive proficiency after taking the Window 3 Diagnostics in i-Ready Reading.

Currently, Grade 3 shows 38% proficiency in reading.

Grade 4 shows 30% proficiency in reading.

Grade 5 shows 19% proficiency in reading.

With the new Benchmark Curriculum in place with Grades 3-5, we are focusing on the following instructional practices for reading:

Focus on meaning

Read aloud

Improve Fluency

Improve Vocabulary

Improve Comprehension

Teach the 3 main types of reading strategies: skimming, scanning, and in-depth reading

Text comprehension

Written expression

Spelling and handwriting

Focus on strategies to develop reading skills: activating, summarizing, clarifying, organizing, search and selecting, questioning, and inferring.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Identify the desired result of the implemented technique

Plan evidence of the desired result

Plan to identify challenges preventing students from being able to demonstrate the desired result Use evidence to confirm the desired result

Check whether students independently demonstrate the desired result without being prompted Notice which students need adaptations

Teach students to monitor themselves and seek adaptations when necessary

Plan for evidence that shows students feel there are high expectations of them

Plan to identify challenges preventing students from feeling there are high expectations of them

Use a monitoring technique to look for evidence that shows students feel there are high expectations of them

Check if students participate and interact without reserve

Notice if students respond positively to interactions

Check if students are willing to take risks and accept academic challenges

Examine if students draw conclusions and provide sources of evidence

Notice if students answer difficult questions

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hibler, Derrick, derrick.hibler@palmbeachschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidencebased Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

All Grade levels K-5 are using the District Scope & Sequence along with all related resources in Blender to engage all students in research-based, relevant teaching and responsive experiences in service of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.

Our K-2 teachers will use the K-2 Star and 3-5 teachers will use F.A.S.T. progress Monitoring Platforms throughout the school year to check the academic progress of all of our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All resorces and materials that are in Blender supports the needs of all of our students in grades K-5. All lessons in Blender shows that they are strongly algned to the B.E.S.T. Standards for our targeted population.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

For Literacy Leadership - (K-5)

- 1. Implement school-wide lesson plan template for small group reading instruction.
- 2. Every student will complete 45 minutes of Reading instruction on i-Ready Weekly.
- 3. Weekly learning walks will be implemented by the principal to build professional conversations in our weekly meetings on next steps for improvements for any of our teachers throughout the school year.

Hibler, Derrick, derrick.hibler@palmbeachschools.org

For Literacy Coaching (K-5)

- 1. Consistent planning for small group instruction which includes student talk and higher-order questioning.
- 2. Consistent execution of small group instruction
- 3. Build teacher capacity for high quality small group instruction
- 4. Build teacher capacity for rigorous whole group instruction using the gradual release of responsibility model, with a focus on teacher questioning and student talk

Hibler, Derrick, derrick.hibler@palmbeachschools.org

For Assessment - (K-5)

- 1. Progress Monitoring (PM) will be provided to our students 3 times per school year to help teachers & administrators see what areas are needed for improvement from their classroom instruction.
- 2. i-Ready Reading will be utilized 15 to 20 minutes daily in all classes for students to work at their own learning levels. i-Ready reports are utilized by teachers to help guide and support all students in differentiated instruction for their area of improvements.
- 3. We will be using the FY23 Progress Monitoring Matrix sent by the District to monitor all assessments for K-5 throughout the school year.

Hibler, Derrick, derrick.hibler@palmbeachschools.org

For Professional Learning - (K-5)

- 1. Provide professional development for teachers based from classroom visits and data collected from PLC Meetings.
- 2. All teachers will select the Marzano PGP Element #20 Communicating High Expectations For Each Student, and will be provided PD on developing to Innovating with this element by the end of the school year.

Hibler, Derrick, derrick.hibler@palmbeachschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Last Modified: 5/20/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 26 of 28

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42; continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of the Holocaust

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, with school board 2.09 and Florida State statue 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures.

Suite 360 is the curriculum that the school district selected to implement the five hour state mandated instruction related to youth mental health and awareness. Throughout the suite 360 curriculum, students participated in lessons on the following topics: Mental Health Awareness and Assistance, Healthy Coping Skills for Teens, #STOPTHESTIGMA- The Truth About Mental Health Conditions, Supporting Someone with a Mental Health Condition, Prevention of Substance Misuse, Child Trafficking, and Awareness of Resources and the Process of Assessing Treatment.

The School Behavioral Health Professional (SBHP) supports the behavioral and mental health of students. The SBHP position started for the 2019-2020 school year as part of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act to have more mental health professionals in schools and is funded through local referendum dollars. All schools in Palm Beach County have a SBHP.

The School Behavioral Health Professional (SBHP) supports the behavioral and mental health of students. The SBHP position started for the 2019-2020 school year as part of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act to have more mental health professionals in schools and is funded through local referendum dollars. All schools in Palm Beach County have a SBHP.

Our Family Resource Center will support families with monthly educational workshops facilitated by our School Counselors, Case Manager, Behavioral Health Specialist, Co-Located Therapist, and Single School Culture Coordinator. English language learning technology (Rosetta Stone) will also be available for interested families for use on-site and at home. Additional resources (e.g., school supplies and clothing) will be distributed by our Case Manager and School Counselors through the Family Resource Center.

Additional resources (e.g., clothing, backpacks, supplies) are provided to students experiencing homelessness. Our Case Manager and School Counselors work in partnership with families and the District McKinney-Vento liaison to ensure the needs of these families and students are met.

A District Migrant Liaison coordinates with our ESOL Coordinator and ESOL School Counselor to provide school and community support services for the families of our migrant students. These supports are supplemental to school-wide supports for students and families.

Our ESOL Coordinator work in conjunction with the District's Multicultural Department to ensure the implementation with fidelity of programs and services designed to improve the outcomes of our English Language Learners.

Safe and Drug Free Schools initiatives such as Red Ribbon Week and other programs that support

prevention of violence in and around the school are implemented on an ongoing basis. A co-located therapist, and a behavioral health specialistis is located full-time on campus. These staff and programs work in concert to prevent the use of alcohol, tobacco, drugs, and foster a safe, drug free learning environment supporting student wellness, student achievement, and appreciation for diversity.

The school nurse provides support and nutrition information for those students who have food allergies or have been diagnosed with diabetes.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

- 1. Mark Pruzansky Guidance Counselor
- 2. Tameka Warren PLC Coordinator / Activities Coordinator
- 3. Altoria Henley Assistant Principal
- 4. Tedrick Patterson PE Coach / After School Coordinator & Activities
- 5. Herbert Crawford After School Coordinator & Activities
- 6. Derrick Hibler Principal
- 7. Danielle Jablon School Cafeteria Manager