The School District of Palm Beach County

# Loxahatchee Groves Elementary



# 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Loxahatchee Groves Elementary

16020 OKEECHOBEE BLVD, Loxahatchee, FL 33470

https://lges.palmbeachschools.org

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2017-18 Title I School** | **2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 67% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 46% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | B | B | B* |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 11/14/2018.

## 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.**

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School's mission is to engage and empower all of our students in a STEAM education in order for them to reach their highest potential.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Vision of Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School is to create a safe and supportive environment in which students will be able to excel academically, take ownership of their learning and find the great enthusiasm that will fire their curiosity and passion for lifelong learning, discovery and creativity. Our students will ASK critical questions, IMAGINE possibilities, PLAN collaboratively, CREATE innovative solutions and IMPROVE continuously.

### School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Title |
|------|-------|
| Myerson, Richard | Principal |
| McCallum, David | Assistant Principal |
| D'angelo, Renee | Teacher, PreK |
| Martin, Anita | Teacher, K-12 |
| Stefancik, Linda | Teacher, PreK |
| Gonzalez, Jelina | Teacher, K-12 |
| Lalama, Lindsay | Teacher, K-12 |
| Joy, Amy | Teacher, K-12 |
| Tetreault, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 |
| Levitt, Sharyn | Teacher, K-12 |
| Ireland, Shira | Teacher, K-12 |
| Stewart, Catherine | Teacher, K-12 |
| Gailey, Shannon | Teacher, K-12 |

**Duties**

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.**

The School Leadership Team meets monthly with School Administration to discuss academic, safety, community issues. The team plans and works together to find solutions to identified topics of concern.

### Early Warning Systems

**Year 2017-18**

**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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 19 | 19 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 7 | 23 | 24 | 14 | 16 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 15 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 12 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 2 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

**Date this data was collected**
Tuesday 8/21/2018

### Year 2016-17 - 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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 18 | 22 | 17 | 21 | 31 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 20 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 7 | 9 | 4 | 20 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |

### Year 2016-17 - 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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 18 | 22 | 17 | 21 | 31 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 20 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 7 | 9 | 4 | 20 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**Assessment & Analysis**
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

The students in the Lowest 25% in math and ELA scored the lowest. This is the 2nd year in a row that the Lowest @5% in math scored below 50%.
The Hispanic students and SWD scored the lowest in ELA.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

ELA- Lowest 25%
Math Learning Gains and Lowest 25%

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

The math Learning Gains and the Math Lowest 25% had the biggest gaps.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

Math and ELA at Level 3 and above and ELA Learning Gains showed the greatest growth.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

Monitoring of the FSQ?USA lead to this growth.

**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 | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 60% | 57% | 56% | 51% | 52% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 63% | 61% | 55% | 50% | 56% | 52% |

| School Grade Component | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 56% | 48% | 44% | 51% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 72% | 65% | 62% | 69% | 61% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 56% | 63% | 59% | 71% | 61% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | 53% | 47% | 61% | 51% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 59% | 56% | 55% | 55% | 53% | 51% |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 19 (16) | 19 (12) | 12 (8) | 10 (11) | 9 (9) | 15 (14) | 84 (70) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 3 (0) | 4 (0) | 8 (4) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 7 (18) | 23 (22) | 24 (17) | 14 (21) | 16 (31) | 29 (24) | 113 (133) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 13 (22) | 15 (20) | 28 (31) | 56 (73) |

**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 | 2018 | 57% | 56% | 1% | 57% | 0% |
| | 2017 | 53% | 54% | -1% | 58% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 54% | 58% | -4% | 56% | -2% |
| | 2017 | 48% | 57% | -9% | 56% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 60% | 59% | 1% | 55% | 5% |
| | 2017 | 47% | 52% | -5% | 53% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 72% | 63% | 9% | 62% | 10% |
| | 2017 | 65% | 62% | 3% | 62% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 61% | 63% | -2% | 62% | -1% |
| | 2017 | 69% | 64% | 5% | 64% | 5% |

| MATH | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 72% | 66% | 6% | 61% | 11% | |
| | 2017 | 56% | 61% | -5% | 57% | -1% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 56% | 56% | 0% | 55% | 1% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 24 | 39 | 47 | 41 | 57 | 42 | 50 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 48 | 45 | 59 | 59 | 60 | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 62 | | 56 | 31 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 57 | 47 | 68 | 58 | 42 | 55 | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 65 | 44 | 77 | 58 | 50 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 60 | 44 | 66 | 54 | 47 | 52 | | | | |
| 2017 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 | 24 | 41 | 54 | 41 | 58 | 46 | 44 | | | | |
| ELL | 17 | 56 | 73 | 50 | 50 | 55 | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 75 | | 65 | 65 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 45 | 53 | 58 | 60 | 47 | 38 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 58 | 60 | 71 | 60 | 31 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 55 | 67 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 55 | | | | |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement
Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

**Areas of Focus:**

### Activity #1

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Lowest 25% in ELA |
| **Rationale** | FSA ELA data identified the lowest 25% and making limited learning gains. Only 48% of the students made learning gains. |
| **Intended Outcome** | 68% of the lowest 25% will make a learning gain on the 2019 FSA ELA assessment, up from 48% on the 2018 ELA FSA. |
| **Point Person** | David McCallum (david.mccallum@palmbeachschools.org) |

**Action Step**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Loxahatchee Groves does provide rigorous tasks to students by engaging the Pillars of Effective Instruction.<br>Students in the lowest 25% will be given direct instruction using LLI in small group settings during iii.<br>Additional staff will assist during iii to lower the teacher to student ratio, allowing the students to engage in learning through small group instruction. This will include extended learning opportunities that support individualized/differentiated instruction to include the infusion of content required by Florida Statute 1003.42 (2) and SB Policy 2.09 pertaining to Single School Culture.<br>Purchase and implement Fundations in the primary grades.<br>Develop and establish grade level expectations for writing Kindergarten through 5th grade.<br>Support classroom teachers in the planning of differentiated instruction within daily lesson planning.<br>Utilize Weekly PLC's to develop and share strategies that support individualized /differentiated instruction within and across grade levels.<br>Utilize iReady diagnostic data to identify areas of need, then focusing the use of the iReady interactive computer program and workbooks to address identified areas and expose students to texts with higher complexity.<br>Purchase teacher resources to improve ELA instruction. |
| **Person Responsible** | David McCallum (david.mccallum@palmbeachschools.org) |

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Data for lowest 25% will be monitored throughout the year using all District Common Assessments and iReady Growth Monitoring assessments.<br>Schedule assistance for iii.<br>Monitor PLC Agendas.<br>Monitor and support develop of effective Lesson plans. |
| **Person Responsible** | David McCallum (david.mccallum@palmbeachschools.org) |

| Activity #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Lowest 25% in Mathematics |
| **Rationale** | FSA Math data identified the lowest 25% and making limited learning gains. Only 45% made learning gains. |
| **Intended Outcome** | 66% of the lowest 25% will make a learning gain on the 2019 FSA Math assessment, up from 45% on the 2018 Math FSA. |
| **Point Person** | David McCallum (david.mccallum@palmbeachschools.org) |
| **Action Step** | |
| **Description** | Loxahatchee Groves does provide rigorous tasks to students by engaging the Pillars of Effective Instruction.<br>Establish school expectations for small group math instruction to ensure students have the opportunity for learning through small group instruction. This will include extended learning opportunities that support individualized /differentiated instruction to include the infusion of content required by Florida Statute 1003.42 (2) and SB Policy 2.09 pertaining to Single School Culture.<br>Support classroom teachers in the planning of differentiated instruction within daily lesson planning.<br>Utilize Weekly PLC's to develop and share strategies that support individualized /differentiated instruction within and across grade levels.<br>Purchase MobyMax to give students math fact practice that can be monitored by teachers.<br>Maximize time in aftercare programs to assist with math facts practice.<br>Use math notebooks for parent communication.<br>Utilize iReady diagnostic data to identify areas of need, then focusing the use of the iReady interactive computer program and iReady tool box for remediation, purchasing paper for teachers to print lessons. |
| **Person Responsible** | David McCallum (david.mccallum@palmbeachschools.org) |
| **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness** | |
| **Description** | Data for lowest 25% will be monitored throughout the year using all District Common Assessments and iReady Growth Monitoring assessments.<br>Schedule assistance for iii.<br>Monitor PLC Agendas.<br>Monitor and support develop of effective Lesson plans. |
| **Person Responsible** | David McCallum (david.mccallum@palmbeachschools.org) |

## 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, Â§ 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.**

We want to see an increase in the numbers of parents/guardians who are visibly seen on our school campus for various school related functions/activities
. • Soliciting feedback from parents regarding their comfort level in contacting teachers and administrators with questions or problems;
• During Open House, curriculum night, etc. ensure non-threatening methods of introducing parents to teachers and administrators;
• Offer fun, interactive tutorials to parents who are unfamiliar with educational technology;
• Communicate school news to parents through monthly newsletter;
• Positive notes, letters, phone calls home;

### 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.**

•Purchase SUITE 360 and implement the program through the guidance program.
•Operational school based team that meets weekly to discuss students with barriers to academic and social success;
•Mentors assigned to students identified with concerns;
•Check-in/Check-out, Check and Connect utilized with students in need of positive adult interactions and positive feedback throughout the school day.
•Instruction and various campus activities that address social/emotional needs of students;
•Connect students to agencies who have Cooperative Agreements or are on campus (DATA, YSB, CHS, Care- Giving Youth, etc);
•Develop and implement a comprehensive school counseling program (Student Development Plan) with dedicated time to: (1) Assess the needs of the students and the barriers blocking their success (Data-Driven Decision Making), (2) Identify interventions that the research suggests works to remove the barrier to success (Evidence-Based Intervention), and (3) Evaluate your intervention and evolve (Evaluation).
•Engage with identified staff (i.e. school counselor, school-based team leader) to provide a differentiated delivery of services based on student/school need. Include core (classroom guidance, workshop, assembly), supplemental (solution focused small group counseling), and intensive supports (individual counseling/advisement, referral to community resources). Utilize data-based decision making to close academic, social-emotional and college-career equity gaps by connecting all students with the services they need.

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

1. As an early intervention to increase reading on grade level by third grade and to increase student readiness to enter kindergarten, Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School offers a school year Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) program that is supplemented with enrichment hours. This VPK program is supported by the Department of Early Childhood Education and follows all statutes, rules and contractual mandates in the Florida VPK Statewide Provider Agreement, including the use of a developmentally appropriate curriculum that enhances the age-appropriate progress of children in attaining each of the performance standards adopted by the Florida DOE. Participating children are expected to transition to kindergarten ready to learn and be successful in school and later life.

2. Host Kindergarten Round-Up to share Kindergarten readiness activities the parents can do with their children during the summer.
3. Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School will coordinate with area day care centers with our Kindergarten readiness expectations.
4. Loxahatchee Groves Elementary will have a staggered start schedule during the first three days of

school for our Kindergarten and VPK students.
5. Incoming Kindergarten parents will visit the classrooms during Kindergarten Round-Up.

**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.**

Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) are employed. Administration matches teachers' qualifications to their assignments and job responsibilities. Scheduling includes Tier 1 instruction (Tier 2 and 3 is provided if needed). The School Leadership Team uses data to analyze the needs of the school and assigns staff members to meet these needs. Regular Learning Team Meetings and Grade Chair Meetings are used for monitoring and problem-solving.

District Title I and Title II funds offer;
Literacy Cohort Training from district personnel
Area Support Teams in literacy, math, and science.
Homeless Program

Other District Resources;
SAI Teacher to give direct instruction to identified students below grade level in reading.
VPK Program that develops foundational skills needed for success in Kindergarten.

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

N/A

| Part V: Budget | |
|---|---|
| **Total:** | **$5,624.43** |