

The School District of Palm Beach County

Palm Beach Virtual Franchise



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Palm Beach Virtual Franchise

9482 MACARTHUR BLVD, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33403

www.palmbeachvirtual.org

Demographics

Principal: Bradley Henry

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	11%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (81%) 2014-15: A (89%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For 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:

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Palm Beach Virtual Franchise

9482 MACARTHUR BLVD, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33403

www.palmbeachvirtual.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	26%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

We are committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers (SDPBC Mission Statement).

Provide the school's vision statement.

We envision a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy (SDPBC Vision Statement).

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
Henry, Bradley	Other	Director of Hospital Homebound, Home Education, and Virtual Programs. Instructional leadership conduit responsible for the oversight of evaluations, budget, legal, audit, and contract, as well as the review of student data for academically appropriate course placement.
Davis, Juliana	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader responsible for the oversight of professional development, school improvement, and course development. Shared decision making with leadership team regarding professional development needs, school improvement, and course development.
Putre, Heidi	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader regarding Edgenuity blended learning and program monitoring. Shared decision making with leadership team regarding graduation process and program monitoring.
Ciotti, Beverly	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher 2: Instructional leader responsible for VSA support; coordinates educational events and special events, substitute support, ELL translation, proctored exams, district student VSA support.
Sorg, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher 3: Instructional leader responsible for monitoring curriculum alignment and best practices with FLVS including VSA and Educator software best practices, processes, support and training for teachers; report monitoring for students, coordination of support for new virtual teachers, monitor FLVS quality assurance, and academic integrity efforts.
Terribile, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher 1: Shared decision making regarding K-12 instruction. Edgenuity point of contact. Directs the MTSS process as needed for full time student support. Supervises SBT/ Rtl processes, and directs Performance Matters diagnostic assessments to monitor progress. Professional Development Team: eLearning Contact, Agendas, Attendance, and Points Assessment
Mammolito, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair. Responsible for co-leading the development of the school improvement plan and SAC meetings. Shared decision making in developing, reporting, and monitoring the school improvement plan based on needs assessment/ analysis. Coordinate and facilitate School Advisory Council meetings. Ensure SIP and SAC compliance and reporting. Shared decision making with the professional development team to align professional development with SIP goals. Marzano Liaison: PGP support; shared decision making and implementation

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		as part of the professional development team. Head Homeroom Teacher. Design and monitor homeroom support system. Assign students to homerooms. Monitors and coaches teachers in updating progress reports for students. Shared decision making regarding best practices to monitor student progress and individual goals.
Sittig, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Professional Development Instructional leader in charge of professional development, shared decision making and implementation as part of the leadership team. Professional Learning Community Facilitator: Shared decision making and direction for quarterly PLC meetings. SAC Co-Chair. Responsible for leading the development of the school improvement plan and SAC meetings. Shared decision making in developing, reporting, and monitoring the school improvement plan based on needs assessment/ analysis. Coordinate and facilitate School Advisory Council meetings. Ensure SIP and SAC compliance and reporting. Shared decision making with the professional development team to align professional development with SIP goals.
Holley, Janel	School Counselor	Guidance Specialist. Instructional leader and guidance conduit. Shared decision making in student placement, data monitoring, testing coordination, and school improvement plan.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	5	12	10	19	36	98
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	1	3	1	0	5
	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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/9/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	90%	56%	61%	95%	46%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	58%	59%	71%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	69%	53%	62%	73%	43%	58%
Math Learning Gains	44%	55%	59%	55%	48%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	80%	45%	56%	90%	41%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	91%	75%	78%	86%	67%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	8 (0)	5 (0)	12 (0)	10 (0)	19 (0)	36 (0)	98 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	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)
One or more suspensions	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)
Course failure in ELA or Math	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)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	5 (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)

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					
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	58%	-58%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	90%	56%	34%	55%	35%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		90%				
Cohort Comparison		90%				
10	2019	80%	54%	26%	53%	27%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		80%				
Cohort Comparison		80%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	61%	-61%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	60%	-60%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	35%	-35%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	39%	-39%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	64%	-64%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	65%	-65%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	51%	-51%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	69%	6%	67%	8%
2018	0%	67%	-67%	65%	-65%
Compare		75%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	69%	20%	70%	19%
2018	94%	68%	26%	68%	26%
Compare		-5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	60%	-60%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	100	85		69	50						
WHT	85	63		68	38					100	57
FRL	86	64		50	30						
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
WHT	81	56		77	56			100		90	68
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
WHT	93	67		80	47		93			100	55

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	75
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	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	76
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The lowest performing component was math learning gains at 44%, below the district and state level and a 13% drop from last year. Factors contributing to this decline were the number of students with a score of 1 or 2 on the Alg 1 and Geo EOC.

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

Math learning gains had the greatest decline, a 13% drop to 44%. Math achievement dropped 11% to 69%. Factors contributing to this were the number of students with a 1-2 on the Alg 1 and Geo EOC tests.

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.

Greatest gap was an additional 29% above the state in ELA achievement with 90% achievement for ELA. ELA has been a focus within the school. ELA team works closely together and added PBPA diagnostics.

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

The data component showing the most improvement is Science achievement with an increase of 13%. The school focused on 8th grade SSA prep. Bio EOC prep is infused in FLVS curriculum.

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

Potential Areas of concern: Math achievement; math learning gains

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

1. Math Achievement
2. Math Learning Gains
3. ELA Achievement
4. ELA Learning Gains
5. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	To ensure progress toward student achievement in Math Achievement to support the expectations of Long Term Outcome, High School Readiness.
Rationale	Math achievement has shown a low performing trend and dropped last year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve Math Achievement by 6% to reach 75%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Juliana Davis (juliana.davis@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Infuse the standards-based FLVS content for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade math as well as Alg 1, Alg 2, and Geometry courses with evaluation and support through the use of the district's testing program: PM Unify/ Performance Matters/ Powerschool. As needed, teachers can also provide access to other asynchronous tools such as Virtual Tutor and Khan Academy. 2. Provide support teacher focus for students retaking the Algebra 1 EOC and intentional homeroom assignment for students across grade levels who have earned a 1-2 on the previous year's Math FSA/ EOC test. 3. Monitor engagement with course material through homeroom teacher program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Scaffolded asynchronous tools such as Virtual Tutor and Khan academy can help to provide differentiated support for all students as needed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supplementing the standards-based FLVS content with support through PM Unify/ Performance Matters/ Powerschool allows the math teacher to provide quick standards based assessments on how the students are performing on specific standards. Standards Based worksheets as well as standards based diagnostics for the EOC courses will also allow the teacher to provide targeted enrichment lessons and student support. 2. Focused support-teacher assignment for retake students and low performing students allows fluid communication between teacher and student so student has access to all available materials for support. 3. By monitoring engagement with course material, the homeroom teacher program increases "time in seat" so students are not rushing through material at the end of the semester.
Action Step	
Description	Pillars of Effective Instruction - Students are immersed in rigorous tasks 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 with a focus on math achievement. This includes History of Holocaust, History of Africans and African Americans, Hispanic Contributions, Women's Contributions, Sacrifices of Veterans and the value of Medal of Honor recipients. Our school integrates Single School Culture by instilling an appreciation for multicultural diversity by getting to know each of our students and their families as well as through our standards-based curriculum.

1. Provide support for resource access to teachers and students; assign and release local and state diagnostics for progress monitoring; analyze results to provide targeted reteach enrichment. As needed, provide login instructions for asynchronous tools such as Virtual Tutor and Khan Academy.
2. Assign all retake students to a math support teacher before retakes; provide test retake resources; assign students with a level 1-2 to homeroom first so they have the math teacher for added support.
3. Assign all full time students to a homeroom teacher; monitor progress weekly; assess learning environment based on progress; complete individualized semester data chats.

Person Responsible Sarah Mammolito (sarah.mammolito@palmbeachschools.org)

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).

Pillars of Effective Instruction - Students are immersed in rigorous tasks 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 with a focus on math achievement. The standards infused curriculum includes 1003.42 (g) History of Holocaust, (h) History of Africans and African Americans, (p) Hispanic Contributions, (q) Women's Contributions, (t) Sacrifices of Veterans and the value of Medal of Honor recipients.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by instilling an appreciation for multicultural diversity by getting to know each of our students and their families as well as through our standards-based curriculum.

Homeroom monitoring will be used to address remaining priorities by maintaining student focus on academic achievement.