Allamanda Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Allamanda Elementary School

10300 ALLAMANDA DR, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410

https://a1es.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Corey Ferrera

Start Date for this Principal: 1/20/2000

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: B (60%) 2014-15: A (72%)
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

Allamanda Elementary School

10300 ALLAMANDA DR, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410

https://a1es.palmbeachschools.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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

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

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.

Allamanda is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for productive careers, responsible citizenship and healthy lifestyles.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Allamanda, as part of the School District of Palm Beach County, envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education, healthy choices, and lifelong learning are valued, supporting all learners to 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
Berling, Ryann	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for Kindergarten. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Gross, Helen	Teacher, ESE	Team leader for ESE. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Black, Christine	Teacher, ESE	Team leader for ESE. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Feinsinger, Deborah	Teacher, ESE	Team leader for Interventions. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Garcia, Marilu	Principal	All administrative duties and responsibilities as assigned particularly focused on reading achievement.
Sunshine, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for Fine Arts. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Meumann, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 5th Grade. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Wolfe, Kristy	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 3rd Grade. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Vonderhaar, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 2nd Grade. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Robins, Bethany	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 1st Grade. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
McComas, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 4th Grade. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Jones, Jacob	Teacher, ESE	Team leader for ESE. Meets with administration in an informational type meeting on a monthly basis. Serves as PLC leader. Their work revolves around student achievement: data analysis, student issues (academic, attendance, behavioral), remediation and testing.
Starr, Matt	Assistant Principal	All administrative duties and responsibilities as assigned particularly focused on math achievement.
Walker, Don	Teacher, K-12	All ELA duties as assigned. Also oversees Science achievement.

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	103	113	131	102	98	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	678
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	16	13	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	23	32	33	39	29	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	11	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	5	7	8	21	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	3	3	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
30

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	29	17	7	20	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	26	16	35	34	38	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	9	4	2	17	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	29	17	7	20	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	26	16	35	34	38	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	9	4	2	17	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	71%	58%	57%	68%	53%	55%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	68%	63%	58%	65%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	56%	53%	62%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	73%	68%	63%	67%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	68%	62%	72%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	59%	51%	75%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	51%	53%	65%	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	103 (0)	113 (0)	131 (0)	102 (0)	98 (0)	131 (0)	678 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	22 (29)	21 (17)	16 (7)	13 (20)	15 (9)	4 (12)	91 (94)
One or more suspensions	1 (2)	0 (1)	1 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (2)	5 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	23 (26)	32 (16)	33 (35)	39 (34)	29 (38)	34 (36)	190 (185)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	22 (22)	11 (20)	28 (21)	61 (63)

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	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%
	2018	66%	56%	10%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	62%	13%	58%	17%
	2018	63%	58%	5%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	65%	59%	6%	56%	9%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	65%	4%	62%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	71%	63%	8%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	67%	17%	64%	20%
	2018	70%	63%	7%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison	14%					
Cohort Comparison	13%					
05	2019	64%	65%	-1%	60%	4%
	2018	65%	66%	-1%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	-6%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison	-15%					
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	55	54	39	64	58	39	31				
ELL	53	52	42	67	61		17				
ASN	81			90	90						
BLK	56	60	55	64	52	37	29				
HSP	62	57	47	61	54	33	44				
MUL	78			63							
WHT	83	75	64	84	75	57	84				
FRL	65	65	60	66	65	49	48				
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	55	59	60	56	64	58	53				
ELL	46	57	55	57	58	40					
ASN	71	80		86	90						
BLK	51	54	45	68	60	50	56				
HSP	68	71	71	63	62	45	67				
MUL	71	70		57	60						
WHT	83	60		78	55	67	80				

| 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
FRL	62	61	59	67	59	50	64				

| 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	49	51	59	52	57	75	39				
ELL	24	59	82	34	71						
BLK	44	55	59	59	73	63	43				
HSP	67	66	57	59	70	85	71				
MUL	82	86		76	86						
WHT	80	65	67	74	69	70	71				
FRL	63	67	70	60	66	72	62				

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	60
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	48
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	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	50
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	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	75
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	57
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.

Learning gains for the lowest 25% in reading and math showed the lowest performance. Over time, reading generally went up and down, while math has shown a downward trend over the last two years. A contributing factor would be our inflexible master schedule, allowing less time for the most needy in math.

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

Our Science proficiency level dropped from 70% to 55% in 2019. Our mid-year diagnostics predicted much better results, possibly quelling our sense of urgency. Extra remediation, tutoring, and support was considered unnecessary.

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.

Our third grade reading proficiency is 61% passing. This is a drop from 66%. To align with district goals, the gap is considerable. Many students required and received intervention services. Concentration of limited resources requires more planning, data analysis, and strategic remediation.

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

Our overall proficiency rate in both reading and math held, increasing slightly. We did much staff development in reading throughout the year, particularly in the area of writing. Attention was also paid to our math proficiency rate. We analyzed mid-year data and provided targeted remediation and tutoring.

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

Data indicates that our learning gains in math, particularly with the lowest 25% are lower than both the district and the state.

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

1. Proficiency rate in third grade reading
2. Percent of lowest 25 making learning gains in math
3. Proficiency rate in science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Proficiency rate in third grade reading
Rationale	As part of the district strategic plan,LTO #1, increasing third grade reading at Allamanda is needed on a school based level but also is in line with the bigger district picture.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Allamanda will increase our third grade proficiency rate five percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Marilu Garcia (marilu.garcia@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our third grade ELA team at Allamanda will participate in the following: 1. Targeted professional development 2. Data based instruction 3. Social emotional initiatives
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Allamanda is aligning our strategies with those that are part of the district strategic plan.
Action Step	
Description	1a. Participate in the following PD: Reading Scope and Module Training, Guide Reading with a focus on word work (team request), integrating technology (SmartBoard) into reading classes, Trailblazer training, and iReady student reports for incoming 3rd graders. 1b. Participate in district second grade reading cadre. 2a. Participate in bimonthly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): analyzing data, planning lessons, sharing student work and assessments, and collaborating on remediation and intervention. 2b. Collaborate with intervention team on remediation: behavior and academics. 2c. Increase the level of nonfiction reading, providing all teachers with NewsELA. 2d. Implement Fountas and Pinnell guided reading kits in grades K-3. 3a. Participate in the Harvard Proving Ground Attendance Pilot, focusing on attendance. 3b. Continue work on My Classroom Economy, requesting PD as necessary. 3c. Continue Health and Wellness initiatives, particularly Mindfulness. 3d. Pilot Morning Meeting. Monitoring will occur through classroom walks and student data analysis.
Person Responsible	Marilu Garcia (marilu.garcia@palmbeachschools.org)

#2	
Title	To ensure effective and relevant instruction towards Learning gains for the lowest 25% in math
Rationale	As Allamanda examines our subgroups and desires equitable success for all students, learning gains for the lowest 25% in math is the most noticeable gap.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Allamanda will increase the learning gains for the lowest 25% in math by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Starr (matthew.starr@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Math teachers in grade four and five will participate in the following: 1. Professional development 2. Team collaboration (PLC) 3. Extended learning opportunities for students 4. Social emotional initiatives
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using diagnostics, iReady, and FSA data, selected strategy is best practice as cited by the district strategic plan.

Action Step	
Description	1a. Implement new math curriculum, Envision, and SuccessMaker, participating in district-provided professional development, including school-based question/answer. 1b. Participate in the district math cadres. 2a. Identify the lowest 30%, targeting instruction, based on item analysis. 2b. Collaborate on data analysis, lesson planning, and instructional strategies, during biweekly PLCs. 2c. Plan co-teaching and remediation with the intervention team. 3a. Offer extended learning opportunities for the lowest 30% based on need: FSQs, USAs, and diagnostic data. 3b. Provide parent education on math app and various methods to support math students at home. 3c. Investigate high school students for math tutoring. 4a. Participate in the following Social-Emotional learning initiatives: Morning Meeting, Mindfulness, and My Classroom Economy. Monitoring will occur through classroom walks and student data analysis.
Person Responsible	Matt Starr (matthew.starr@palmbeachschools.org)

#3	
Title	To ensure academic proficiency in Science for all students.
Rationale	As a subject area that dropped unexpectedly after the mid-year, extra focus is necessary to be in line with district and state proficiency rates.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Allamanda will increase the proficiency rate in Science from 55% to 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Don Walker (don.walker@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will participate in the following: 1. Team collaboration (PLC) sharing data and best instructional practices 2. Professional development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	After investigating strategies used by higher performing schools in science, Allamanda will integrate these with district recommended initiatives.

Action Step	
Description	1a. Make master board changes for FY20, better utilizing time and staff. 1b. Facilitate team planning between 4th and 5th grade teachers, using standards, item specs, and school expert, Don Walker. 1c. Following mid year diagnostics, institute targeted tutoring. 1d. Continue implementation of district science curriculum/StemScope that was successful. 2a. Investigate Science Boot Camp. 2b. Plan on-going professional development as needed. Monitoring will occur through classroom walks and student data analysis.
Person Responsible	Don Walker (don.walker@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).

Florida State Statute 1003.42. State Mandate aimed at integrating culturally appropriate content in textbooks and instructional materials.
(g) The history of the Holocaust.
(h) The history of African Americans.
(p) The study of Hispanic contributions to the United States.
(q) the study of women's contributions to the United States.
(t) The sacrifices that veterans and Medal of Honor recipients have made in serving our country and protecting democratic values worldwide.

In alignment with school board policy 2.09 and Florida State Statute 1003.42, our school highlights multicultural diversity within 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 and contributions of black and African Americans, Latino and Hispanics, and women within US History. Our studies of the Holocaust culminate in our safety patrols field trip to Washington, D.C., visiting related sites.

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.

N.A.

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.

All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule. Collaboration occurs across grade levels, content areas, and into feeder schools. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning. School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improve results in instructional practice and student performance.

Strategic Initiatives #1, #2, and #6, are evident in our early intervention program for students with autism. Our two ASD Pre-K classes support the smooth transition to our ASD kindergarten classrooms, providing a continuum of services.

As a Health & Wellness Choice school, ALLAMANDA follows a student recruitment procedure as outlined by the district. We have over 90 students attending this school year due to our CHOICE program. In the spring, a Kindergarten round-up is held for all incoming kindergarteners and their families. ALLAMANDA offers tours of our program in the spring before registration and K round-up time. Kindergarten utilizes a staggered start. Pertinent information, including kindergarten readiness skills and grade-level expectations, is distributed and key staff members are introduced to provide as much support as possible.

In compliance with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas Act, ALLAMANDA now has on campus a full-time Behavioral Health Professional. Guidance classes are provided to all students on our Fine Arts wheel.

ALLAMANDA will pilot Morning Meeting this school year. We also will continue to implement Mindful practices for students and staff.

Families have numerous opportunities to visit the school. In the beginning of the school year, we have both an Open House and a Curriculum Night. Parents will receive necessary information as well as training on how they can best assist their child. This is in line with district Strategic Initiative #2, positive and supportive school climate.

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

Teachers meet in regular Professional Learning Communities (PLC). Planning based on student need and data is our focus. Strategic initiative #1, Effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all

students, is our goal.

Our School-Based Team also functions to support this initiative. Teachers meet with each other and SBT members on a regular basis, coordinating and adjusting services to best meet the needs of all students.

In FY20, ALLAMANDA will continue our cross-grade level committees. Their focus is primarily academic: reading, math, science, and health and wellness. The committee chairs share out at monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, sharing updates and soliciting feedback.

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Proficiency rate in third grade reading				$2,679.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0101 - Allamanda Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	718.0	$2,679.00
			Notes: Instructional materials, classroom libraries, supplies			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To ensure effective and relevant instruction towards Learning gains for the lowest 25% in math				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To ensure academic proficiency in Science for all students.				$0.00
					Total:	$2,679.00