

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Grove Park 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Grove Park Elementary School

8330 N MILITARY TRL, West Palm Beach, FL 33410

<https://gps.palmbeachschools.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Marzella Mitchell**

Start Date for this Principal: 10/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: F (30%) 2014-15: D (32%)
<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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Grove Park Elementary School

8330 N MILITARY TRL, West Palm Beach, FL 33410

<https://gpes.palmbeachschools.org>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">96%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">96%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	C	C	F

## 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.**

Mission Statement: Grove Park Elementary is committed to guiding students to become advocates of excellence in their own learning. At Grove Park, we strive to customize instruction, infused with technology, for all unique learning styles. We celebrate the whole child, by fostering connections across a range of subjects. Parents, teachers, and students collaborate to further develop knowledge and attitudes that lead to global-mindedness and, college and career readiness.

In addition, Grove Park's mission aligns with the district's overall mission for students and school accountability:

The School District of Palm Beach County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

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

Grove Park's vision aligns with the district's overall vision for student achievement and school accountability: The School District of Palm Beach 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
Rogers, JoAnne	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School Accountability, Student Achievement</li> <li>Curriculum/Instructional/Assessment Alignment to Standards</li> <li>Progress Monitoring (Student Proficiency, Gains, Lowest 25%)</li> <li>Closing Achievement Gap</li> <li>Programs (IB Candidate School; Holiday Camps, Tutorials)</li> <li>Professional Development, School Sustainability (Formal &amp; Embedded PD, Coaching, PLC)</li> <li>Highly Qualified Staff</li> <li>IB Candidate School Authorization Process</li>   <li>- Family Involvement</li> <li>Trainings, related to core content areas</li> <li>Curriculum Nights and School Tours</li> <li>School Advisory Council (SAC)</li> <li>Strategies that address/reduce Absenteeism</li> <li>Partnerships</li> <li>Volunteerism</li>   <li>- School Safety</li> <li>FortifyFL</li> <li>Koginto</li> <li>Crisis and Drill Compliance</li> <li>Systems, Routines of the Instructional Day</li> <li>swPBS (Climate, School Morale, Celebrations, Learner Profiles)</li> <li>Clubs (Enrichment): Ballet, Drumline, SECME, Leadership</li>   <li>- Facilities</li> <li>Classroom Environments</li> <li>Maintenance</li> <li>Work Orders</li> </ul>
Mitchell, Marzella	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School Accountability, Student Achievement</li> <li>Curriculum/Instructional/Assessment Alignment to Standards</li> <li>Progress Monitoring (Student Proficiency, Gains, Lowest 25%)</li> <li>Closing Achievement Gap</li> <li>Programs (IB Candidate School)</li> <li>Professional Development for School Sustainability (New Math Series, iReady, PLC)</li> <li>Highly Qualified Staff (New Teachers)</li> <li>Extended Learning Opportunities</li> <li>Assessment</li> </ul>
Chernow, Tracy	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student Diversity, Recruitment</li> <li>Program of Inquiry (horizontal and vertical planning)</li> <li>Professional Development (Coaching, Modeling, Embedded PD, Transdisciplinary Unit Development)</li> <li>Parent Involvement</li> <li>STEM Theme</li> </ul>



**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	14	14	13	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	5	11	3	13	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA or Math	40	44	33	43	36	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	36	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

**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	10	15	11	35	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

**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	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

49

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

Tuesday 10/1/2019

**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	25	20	15	16	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	4	7	8	10	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA or Math	25	36	49	53	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	40	40	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

**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	11	11	14	44	22	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

**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	25	20	15	16	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	4	7	8	10	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA or Math	25	36	49	53	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	40	40	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

**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	11	11	14	44	22	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

**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	39%	58%	57%	34%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	63%	58%	53%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	56%	53%	40%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	68%	63%	48%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	68%	62%	53%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	59%	51%	32%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	51%	53%	33%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	17 (25)	14 (20)	14 (15)	13 (16)	13 (10)	9 (19)	80 (105)
One or more suspensions	5 (4)	11 (7)	3 (8)	13 (10)	16 (12)	6 (13)	54 (54)
Course failure in ELA or Math	40 (25)	44 (36)	33 (49)	43 (53)	36 (17)	23 (0)	219 (180)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	36 (40)	28 (40)	25 (49)	89 (129)

**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	34%	54%	-20%	58%	-24%
	2018	36%	56%	-20%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	62%	-24%	58%	-20%
	2018	31%	58%	-27%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	42%	59%	-17%	56%	-14%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	65%	3%	62%	6%
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	67%	-5%	64%	-2%
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	62%	65%	-3%	60%	2%
	2018	36%	66%	-30%	61%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	51%	-9%	53%	-11%
	2018	28%	56%	-28%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
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	23	50	33	45	74	70	25				
ELL	44	70	68	70	80	67	37				
BLK	35	60	67	62	73	70	39				
HSP	43	71	64	71	83		42				
FRL	38	63	65	64	76	68	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	18	31	19	20	38	38	18				
ELL	35	52	47	51	54		20				
BLK	34	52	55	41	41	30	29				
HSP	40	50	40	59	55		18				
WHT	55			45							
FRL	37	53	53	46	46	39	31				
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	8	41	30	16	27	29					
ELL	15	44	50	43	52	47	14				
BLK	32	50	41	42	53	32	33				
HSP	28	46	38	55	52	36	33				
WHT	64	90		64	60						
FRL	30	50	41	45	52	31	27				

**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	62
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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
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.**

Grove Park increased its school-letter grade from a "C" to a "B." Although there was a slight increase in ELA from 37% in FY18 to 39% in FY19, ELA proficiency continues to be the lowest performance measure as a trend.

2016, 24%

2017, 28%

2018, 37%

2019, 39% (compared to mathematics-66% and science-42%)

Contributing factors to GP's ELA growth trend are students entering third grade as struggling readers, lack of word knowledge and ability to determine word meaning in context, understanding higher text complexity, and overall stamina.

Overall increases include the following:

- 17.4 points in math achievement
- 30.5 points in math gains
- 30.2 points in Low 25 math gains
- 1.2 points in ELA achievement
- 11.9 points in ELA gains
- 13.4 points in Low 25 ELA gains
- 11.1 points in science achievement

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

Although there was a total increase of ELA proficiency from 37% to 39% in FY19, third grade ready proficiency declined 39% to 35% in FY19. This decline is attributed to the high percent of students entering third grade as struggling readers.

**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 had the greatest gap when compared both to state averages and district averages.

District:

Proficiency 59%; Learning Gains, 57%; Lowest 25%, 47%

Grove Park, compared to state averages, by grade level:

Proficiency:

3rd Grade (GP 35%, state 58%)

4th Grade (GP 39%, state 58%)

5th Grade (GP 43%, state 56%)

Although trends show a gradual increase of ELA proficiency over the last four years from 24%, 28%, 37%, to 39%, the gap compared to the state's average is

23 points in 3rd grade;

19 points in 4th; and,

13 points in 5th

Factors that contribute to this gap:

- Students knowledge of the standards, lack of ability to make connections, vocabulary development, stamina, and testing taking strategies.
- Teachers' lack of deep understanding of standards; and instructional delivery of high-yielding instructional strategies that increase students' mastery.

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

Learning gains in mathematics showed the most improvement (49% to 74% 3rd grade; 41% to 82% in 4th grade; and 48% to 77% in 5th grade). Actions taken at the school included:

- Teacher collaboration around the standards (teachers attended PLC with the regional math specialist)

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

Attendance Trends

Grove Park will continue to monitor and address student absenteeism as a goal to reduce, implementing the following strategies:

- Attendance Letters
- Collaboration with regional attendance liaison for identification of students, establishing a plan
- Use of CLF's for home visits, conferencing with parents
- Student recognition and incentives for Perfect Attendance

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

1. Increase of ELA proficiency, gains, and lowest 25%
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	To ensure ELA student proficiency aligns with district's strategic plan to ensure high school readiness.
<b>Rationale</b>	IF we provide effective, relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students, THEN we will increase reading proficiency on grade level by Third Grade
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	In grade 3-5, to increase student proficiency: - From 39% in Fy19 - To 45% in Fy20
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	JoAnne Rogers (joanne.rogers@palmbeachschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Full curriculum alignment to standards (also, instruction, assessment, and resources)</li> <li>- Whole (Explicit), Guided, Small Group Instruction (tailored to needs of each child)</li> <li>- Increased Rigor</li> <li>Scale, Expected Outcomes, Learning Target</li> <li>High Order Questions (Marzano Taxonomy, to knowledge utilization from retrieval)</li> <li>Question Stems</li> <li>Contextual Evidence and Proof</li> <li>Academic Language and Conversations</li> <li>Writing Connected to Reading</li> <li>Vocabulary in Context (spiraled throughout the year in the modules)</li> <li>Regular practice, high text complexity</li> <li>Whole Literacy combined with performance based approaches</li> <li>- Expanding Students Overall Schema &amp; Background Knowledge</li> <li>Field Trips (transferring and applying knowledge outside of the classroom)</li> <li>Unit Integration of STEM components</li> <li>Special Clubs (Ballet, SECME, Leadership, Drumline, Art, Future Teachers, etc)</li> <li>Technology Integration (SMART Panels, 1:1 iPad Rollout, Chromebooks)</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Curriculum Alignment</li> <li>When regularly exposed to standards-based instruction, assessment, and resources, students are better equipped to achieve proficiency and gains.</li> <li>- Whole Group, Guided, Small Group Instruction</li> <li>When instruction goes beyond teacher-explicit delivery to include small group, instruction is then tailored to the individual need of students, for a personal approach to learning.</li> <li>- Increased Rigor</li> <li>When students are regularly exposed to high-yielding strategies through both explicit and small group instruction, students' capacity to apply critical-thinking and problem-solving is increased.</li> <li>- Expanded Student Schema and Background Knowledge</li> <li>Students are better able to connect to text and concepts when knowledge of vocabulary, the world around them, and real experiences are provided beyond the classroom.</li> </ul>
<b>Action Step</b>	



<p><b>Description</b></p>	<p>1. Academic Tutors to provide a double-down model for K-5 classrooms Schedules are maximized to ensure double-down model is implemented across all grade levels. Tutors collaboratively plan for standards and use of appropriate resources with teachers. Tutors use data to infuse areas of instructional weaknesses into lessons.</p>
	<p>2. General education teacher collaboration with ELL/ESE teachers for delivery of standards-based instruction, rigorous strategies, and appropriately used resources. PLC focuses on identifying the standard, a variety of instructional strategies to be implemented (the how) based on monitored data, and effective resources. All teachers leave PLC with an actual plan for instruction and next steps.</p>
	<p>3. Extended Learning Opportunities -After school (Primary: focus on phonics instruction and word study) -Saturday (Intermediate: focus on weak benchmarks, vocabulary development, and test-taking strategies) -Spring Break Tutorials (5th Grade: focus on the scientific method and mini labs linked to benchmarks; with a focus on science vocabulary and language) -Summer Strong (Second graders going into Third: phonics, reading best practices, vocabulary, and weak standards based on spring diagnostics)</p>
	<p>4. Deliberate implementation of real-word, hands-on, field experiences to enhance learning (richer units) Professional Development opportunities and support are provided to develop units using interdisciplinary strategies, inquiry-based learning, STEM infusion, and Marzano Taxonomy.</p>
	<p>5. Expand teacher capacity through: - PLC collaboration - Learning walks (on grade levels, vertical walks, also in other like-schools) - Modeling and Coaching by SSCC, Resource Teachers, Science Coach, IB Coordinator - CWTs with specific, meaningful feedback by the administration - Professional Growth Plans - Regional Instructional Reviews</p>
<p><b>Person Responsible</b></p>	<p>JoAnne Rogers (joanne.rogers@palmbeachschools.org)</p>

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

The History of the Holocaust

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

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

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

swPBS strategies include:

- Student assemblies
- Morning Meetings
- Teaching and learning Learner Profiles
- Rules, Expectations for Playground, Cafeteria, and Attention Signal
- Regular student recognition and celebrations

## 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.**

Grove Park strives to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by implementing the following:

- Meet the Teacher
- Dads Bring Children to School
- Annual Parent Meetings
- Open House
- Curriculum Nights
- STEM Nights
- Parent Conference Day (Intermediate Grades)
- Weekly Newsletters (in print)
- Social Media (Facebook and Twitter)
- Text Messaging
- Agenda Planners
- PYP Journals
- 21st Century Parent Meetings
- SACC Newspaper
- Holiday Programs
- Parent Invitations to Season Activities and Celebrations
- ELL Parent Meetings (Fall and Spring)
- IB Parent Tours
- Choice Showcase Attendance

### 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.**

As an early intervention to increase reading on grade level by third grade and to increase student readiness to enter kindergarten, Grove Park 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.

The Parent Liaison and Guidance Counselor visit the local day cares and pre-school programs to distribute flyers and invitations to the Kindergarten Roundup and Registration. In January of each year, the principal will invite representatives from local daycare centers to discuss school readiness and grade level expectations for students entering Kindergarten in the fall. Pre-K students and their parents will be invited to a special "Open House" in the month of May each year. At the end of the school year, a flyer is distributed announcing our "Kindergarten Roundup". This event is held to provide tours of the school's campus, register prospective kindergarten students, inform parents of kindergarten readiness skills, and provide parents with strategies to assist their child(ren) over the summer. In addition to the flyer, this information is included in newsletter, and on the marquee.

An additional "Kindergarten Roundup" will be held annually in April which will include an Immunization Mobile Unit to provide required immunizations for entering school. Once school has started in the Fall, Grove Park Elementary staggers the start date of the kindergarten students in order to better acclimate them to their new learning environment.

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

Implementation of Tier 3 interventions and provide professional development and technical assistance as needed.

Title I, Part A - Utilize Title I funding to support in-school and after school tutorial programs, purchase instructional materials and assessments, and to purchase instructional coaching positions in reading, mathematics, and science as well as parent involvement related activities.

Title I, Part C - Migrant - Support services are provided by District personnel

Title II - Services are provided through the district to improve the education of English Language Learners by providing educational materials and support services. Through the after-school program and summer school program, students needing additional remediation are provided that opportunity.

Title III - Programs and professional development provided by Safe Schools - Single School Culture, Academic, Behavior and Climate programs, Bullying prevention, Character Education, District Academic Coaches. Through the after-school program and summer school program, students needing additional remediation are provided that opportunity.

Title X - Homeless - McKinney-Vento case managers provided by the school district provides resources such as school supplies, food, and clothing for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to help break down barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) - Funds will provide a teacher to work with students providing in-school and extended day support for struggling readers in grades 2-5.

Violence Prevention Programs - District-wide implementation of Single School Culture as well as Appreciation of Multicultural Diversity.

Nutrition Programs - 100% of our students are provided free breakfast.

Required instruction listed in FL Statute 1003.42(2), as applicable to appropriate grade levels.

**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.**

At Grove Park, curriculum, instruction, and assessments are fully aligned with the strategic plan for high school, college, and career readiness. Other activities include:

- Unit Activities around Themes (Who We Are)
- Nonfictional Reading
- Enrichment Wheel (Business and Career Presentations)
- Middle School and Choice Support to Parents and Student Presentations
- STEM Night partnering with the South Florida Science Museum
- Academic Competitions (SECME, Academic Games, Battle of the Books)
- Student Lead Career Fairs

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

Grove Park partners with Leadership USA that gives students scholarships for college. In addition, clubs are established that promote college mindedness and preparations, including:

- National Honors Society
- Future Teachers of America
- SECME

## 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 ELA student proficiency aligns with district's strategic plan to ensure high school readiness.</b>				<b>\$183,301.87</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	1411 - Grove Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$115,801.87
			<i>Notes: 1.5 teachers</i>			
	5000	160-Other Support Personnel	1411 - Grove Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$67,500.00
			<i>Notes: 5 Academic Tutors</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$183,301.87</b>