

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Lantana Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

# Lantana Elementary School

710 W OCEAN AVE, Lantana, FL 33462

<https://lane.palmbeachschools.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Janyn Robinson**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/2/2015

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (52%)<br>2017-18: C (48%)<br>2016-17: C (46%)<br>2015-16: C (41%)<br>2014-15: C (48%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

# Lantana Elementary School

710 W OCEAN AVE, Lantana, FL 33462

<https://lane.palmbeachschools.org>

## School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 92%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 84%  |

## School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | C       | C       | C       |

## 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 parents, staff and community of our school will provide a safe, nurturing, and equitable education that meets the social, academic and physical needs of each student so that all students will be successful learners and productive citizens who are college and career ready.

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

Lantana Elementary School envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

### 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  |
|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Robinson, Janyn      | Principal           | Maintain focus on academic focus and vision, coaching, feedback, data analysis, monitoring |
| Gordon, Elise        | Instructional Coach | Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring.                |
| Campbell, Elaina     | Other               | Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring.                |
| Ordonez, Lesly       | Teacher, K-12       | Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring.                |
| Rainey-Reese, Ranada | Teacher, K-12       | Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring.                |
|                      | Assistant Principal | Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring.                |

### 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     | 55          | 74 | 67 | 59 | 63 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 400   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 29          | 23 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |
| One or more suspensions         | 2           | 3  | 0  | 15 | 11 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 55          | 47 | 38 | 55 | 61 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 298   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 32 | 38 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 94    |

#### 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 | 25          | 19 | 8 | 38 | 41 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 162   |

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

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

23

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/6/2019

#### 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     | 28          | 17 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 5  | 4  | 9  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 32          | 51 | 51 | 56 | 50 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 289   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 54 | 30 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 113   |

#### 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 | 13          | 14 | 14 | 50 | 38 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 162   |

#### 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     | 28          | 17 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 5  | 4  | 9  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 32          | 51 | 51 | 56 | 50 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 289   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 54 | 30 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 113   |

**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 | 13          | 14 | 14 | 50 | 38 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 162   |

## 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             | 41%    | 58%      | 57%   | 36%    | 53%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 53%    | 63%      | 58%   | 58%    | 59%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 53%    | 56%      | 53%   | 50%    | 55%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 60%    | 68%      | 63%   | 42%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 66%    | 68%      | 62%   | 58%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50%    | 59%      | 51%   | 36%    | 53%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 42%    | 51%      | 53%   | 42%    | 51%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |           |
| Number of students enrolled     | 55 (0)                            | 74 (0)  | 67 (0)  | 59 (0)  | 63 (0)  | 82 (0)  | 400 (0)   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 29 (28)                           | 23 (17) | 10 (17) | 14 (15) | 10 (18) | 15 (9)  | 101 (104) |
| One or more suspensions         | 2 (0)                             | 3 (1)   | 0 (5)   | 15 (4)  | 11 (9)  | 9 (8)   | 40 (27)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 55 (32)                           | 47 (51) | 38 (51) | 55 (56) | 61 (50) | 42 (49) | 298 (289) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 32 (54) | 38 (30) | 24 (29) | 94 (113)  |

### 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 | 44%    | 54%      | -10%                       | 58%   | -14%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 19%    | 56%      | -37%                       | 57%   | -38%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 25%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 26%    | 62%      | -36%                       | 58%   | -32%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 35%    | 58%      | -23%                       | 56%   | -21%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 50%    | 59%      | -9%                        | 56%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 35%    | 59%      | -24%                       | 55%   | -20%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 55%    | 65%      | -10%                       | 62%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 33%    | 63%      | -30%                       | 62%   | -29%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 47%    | 67%      | -20%                       | 64%   | -17%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 59%    | 63%      | -4%                        | 62%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 14%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 75%    | 65%      | 10%                        | 60%   | 15%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 48%    | 66%      | -18%                       | 61%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 27%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 41%    | 51%      | -10%                       | 53%   | -12%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 31%    | 56%      | -25%                       | 55%   | -24%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### 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 |
| SWD                                       | 25       | 38     | 50          | 42        | 60      | 52           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| ELL                                       | 35       | 54     | 50          | 57        | 69      | 53           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 40       | 55     | 56          | 64        | 65      | 40           | 53       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 31       | 44     | 50          | 48        | 63      | 58           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 59       | 63     |             | 79        | 89      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 51     | 53          | 60        | 66      | 51           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 14       | 29     | 36          | 34        | 63      | 71           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 19       | 47     | 56          | 39        | 70      | 61           | 11       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 48     | 40          | 54        | 72      | 65           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 22       | 35     | 58          | 30        | 64      | 67           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 42       | 43     |             | 64        | 75      |              | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 30       | 42     | 44          | 47        | 69      | 66           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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       | 51     | 41          | 22        | 49      | 43           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 26       | 59     | 58          | 35        | 45      | 30           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 58     | 52          | 42        | 64      | 45           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 33       | 51     | 46          | 32        | 43      | 27           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 57       | 77     |             | 51        | 69      |              | 69       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 34       | 58     | 51          | 41        | 57      | 36           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 52  |
| 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 | 53  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 418 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 42  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 51  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| 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                                | 54  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 46  |
| 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   | 66 |
| 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                                | 52 |
| 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.**

ELA achievement is the data component with the lowest performance. The most significant contributing factor to the low performance is the large number of students entering 3rd-5th grades, while reading below grade level.

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

The data component with the greatest decline is Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Although the current data is at 50%, the previous year was 66%. There was a change in teacher as well as a cohort of students with significant math deficiencies.

**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.**

ELA Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The most significant contributing factor to the low performance is the large number of students entering 3rd-5th grades, while reading below grade level.

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

Math achievement is the component that showed the most improvement. We utilized additional resources that were tightly aligned to the standards and FSA item specs. We also engaged students in a daily spiral review.

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

1. Attendance below 90 percent

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

1. ELA achievement
2. Math L25%
3. Attendance below 90 percent
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1

##### Title

To ensure progress towards student achievement in ELA and Math to align with the District's Strategic Plan; LTO #1; Increase Reading On Grade Level; LTO #2; Ensure HS Readiness

##### Rationale

According to our school data, ELA achievement has the greatest gap when compared to State data. We were 16% below the State. Also, it is our lowest performing accountability cell. In addition to ELA, Math lowest 25% learning gains dropped 3% compared to the previous year's data.

##### State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Our measurable goals for FY20 will be to have a 5% increase both ELA achievement and Math lowest 25% learning gains. For ELA, this would be an increase from 41% to 46%. For Math, it will be an increase from 50% to 55%.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Janyn Robinson (janyn.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

##### Evidence-based Strategy

1. Teachers will use grade level, complex text to plan interactive Read Alouds.
2. Differentiated small group instruction within all ELA and Math classrooms.
3. Math teachers will implement a focused curriculum, that is grounded in grade level standards & FSA test design.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

1. Read Alouds address core instruction, and grade level text provides the appropriate complexity for mastery of grade level standards.
2. Differentiation provides equity, because each student is getting the academics they need. This will enable students to achieve learning gains.
3. Standards-based instruction is necessary for mastery of math concepts presented on the FSA.
4. Incorporate STEM lessons to facilitate the learning of both math and science concepts.

#### Action Step

##### Description

1. Focused planning during PLCs (read alouds, small group instruction, math units)
2. Frequent data chats in order to support teachers with forming flexible groups for differentiation
3. School Leadership will monitor classroom instruction and formative data
4. Double-down schedule in most Math classes, to support academic growth of L25%
5. Integrate science into math using STEM lessons, videos, an activities

##### Person Responsible

Janyn Robinson (janyn.robinson@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).**

In alignment with the District's second Strategic Theme (Positive & Supportive School Climate), we have a goal of decreasing the number of students with an attendance rate of less than 90%. Currently, 25% of the students fell into this category. The previous year, it was 26%. Our goal is to decrease this percentage by 5%.

We will address this schoolwide improvement priority with our implementation of Social Emotional Learning (SEL). Schoolwide, students engage in Morning Meeting and then continue to experience SEL Core Competencies throughout the day within the classroom environment as well as within instruction. Coaching and feedback on SEL practices will be provided by School Administration, our school-based SEL Lead, our school-based SEL Champion, as well as a District SEL Specialist.

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 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 expectations for academic and social emotional success. We communicate these expectations with families via newsletters, parent conferences, family events, etc. We also monitor SwPBS at our committee meeting, utilizing data (referral data, SEL survey data, etc.). In alignment to school board 2.09 and Florida State Statute 1003.42, our school addresses multicultural diversity within the curriculum, classroom libraries, and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, music studied during Fine Arts, art projects and lessons during Fine Arts, books related to various cultures in our Media Center, as well as classroom libraries. Our students also attend field trips and/or school presentations that highlight multicultural diversity.

**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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.**

Lantana Elementary is one of the District's pilot schools for Social Emotional Learning. We explicitly incorporate SEL throughout the day, in order to build positive relationships with all stake holders. We also plan family events that incorporate SEL Adult Signature Practices. This is another way to build positive relationships.

**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.**

The PreK classrooms meet all VPK requirements & prepare the students for entry into Kindergarten. Our Pre-K Kindergarten Transition Plan is designed to ensure a smooth transition from Pre-K/home to Kindergarten. The AP coordinates the Pre-School Transition procedures. She facilitates a school tour for children in Head Start programs. Parents of pre-school children are invited to our Kindergarten Round-Up. A Kindergarten information packet is given. We use a staggered start for students. Upon entering Kindergarten, all students are assessed in order to assist in the development of rigorous instruction/intervention programs. Screening data is used to plan daily academic & SEL instruction for all students.

As an early intervention to increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade & to increase student readiness to enter Kindergarten, we offer a school year VPK program that is supplemented with enrichment hours. This VPK program is supported by the Depart. of Early Childhood Ed & follows all statutes & contractual mandates in the Florida VPK Provider Agreement (developmentally appropriate curriculum that enhances the age-appropriate progress of kids in each of the performance standards adopted by the FL DOE).

To assist with the transition of school-based & community children into the kindergarten program, we engage in the following kindergarten transition activities: distribution of a Summer Transition to Kindergarten Backpack with books, transition activities, & a parent guide for its enrolled VPK students (provided by the Department of Early Childhood Education), distribution of a letter & flyer sent to families of preschool children, making plans for preschool children to practice kindergarten routines, & providing for the transmittal of written records of a child's experiences or status to the next teacher.

Screening tools are given mid-year and at the end of the year to determine student learning gains and the need for changes to the instruction/intervention programs.

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

School-based Team - Pamela Camel, Assistant Principal and Sharon Wladimirski, Guidance Counselor, Ranada Reese (ESOL Coordinator), Margo Breistol (ESE Coordinator), Elaina Campbell (SSC Coordinator), Alicia Thomas (SAI Teacher), Janelle Giebus (SAI Teacher), Janyyn Robinson, (Principal) The SBT meets regularly to review universal screening data, diagnostic data, and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team identifies the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. The team identifies students who are not meeting identified academic targets. The identified students are referred to the school-based RtI Leadership Team. Through a shared decision making model, the team determines students needing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Each case is assigned a case liaison to support the interventionist (e.g., teacher, RtI/Inclusion Facilitator,) and progress monitor effectiveness of interventions. The Master Schedule is created to align all resource staff with iii classes and Tier 3 student schedules. A Literacy Resource Teacher is funded through school Title I funds to assist in providing iii services to all Level 1 and Level 2 students in groups of 3-6 students.

Title I funds - Janyyn Robinson, Principal

Based on an analysis of student needs, a Title I budget was created to include a reading resource teacher, math resource teacher, a Single School Culture Coordinator, and certified tutors for additional opportunities to learn, supplies for classroom instruction, instructional software and publications, parent communication, and material for parent training. The Principal and School Treasurer monitor expenditures monthly and ensure alignment with School Improvement Plan goals and strategies and

compliance with Title I requirements. District and Area staff provide professional development through Title I funding, including Literacy school based training.

**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.**

We first analyze previous year's data to determine the resources needed. Then, we create a master schedule that utilizes our personnel to best meet the needs of all students. From there, we establish academic foci that will increase achievement. Once the foci has been determined, we determine the professional development needs across the building. After providing the professional development, the Leadership Team monitors through weekly classroom walkthroughs as well as PLCs that are on a 7-8 day wheel. Teachers utilize research-based and vetted materials so the appropriate standards and rigor are provided to every student. Small group instruction is also part of the content blocks, in order to meet the individual needs of our learners. Mrs. Robinson facilitates the data analysis and master schedule creation. The Leadership Team and PD Team set the academic foci and plan professional development for the year. Administration monitors with classroom walkthroughs, and there are facilitators for PLCs, along with Administration.

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

The school utilizes mentors to make students aware of their choices with regards to college and career awareness. The Guidance Counselors also plans events, like Career Day, to advance awareness.

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

|               |               |   |   |                          |     |                   |
|---------------|---------------|---|---|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| <b>1</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: To ensure progress towards student achievement in ELA and Math to align with the District's Strategic Plan; LTO #1; Increase Reading On Grade Level; LTO #2; Ensure HS Readiness</b> |   |                          |     | <b>\$1,700.00</b> |
|               | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2019-20           |
|               | 5000          | 530-Periodicals   | 0751 - Lantana Elementary School  | School Improvement Funds |     | \$1,700.00        |
|               |               |   | <i>Notes: Purchase Time for Kids and/or Scholastic News for students, in order to increase content knowledge and reading achievement.</i> |                          |     |                   |
| <b>Total:</b> |               |   |   |                          |     | <b>\$1,700.00</b> |