
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sandpiper Shores Elementary School

11201 GLADES RD, Boca Raton, FL 33498

<https://sses.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Monique Coyle

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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 (70%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sandpiper Shores Elementary School

11201 GLADES RD, Boca Raton, FL 33498

<https://sses.palmbeachschools.org>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">46%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">56%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Sandpiper Shores Elementary 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.

Sandpiper Shores Elementary envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Coletto, Stephanie	Principal	The leadership team meets bimonthly to discuss student data and pending rti and SBT progress. We strive to create a single school culture of data driven decisions to guide and support our teams. The leadership team discusses trends in the school and outside community. The leadership team discusses problems in the operation and in function and brainstorms solutions to develop purposeful, personalized support to ensure all students learn. The guidance counselors run a mentoring program. they do social emotional learning groups. Ms. Rice runs our RTI and Ms. Brant is in charge of ESE and runs our School-based team. Our School Behavioral Heath Professional oversees and counsels students in need.
Boone, Sheila	Assistant Principal	All scheduling, discipline, safety, curriculum monitoring, Transportation, non instructional supervision
Brandt, Renee	Teacher, ESE	Scheduling for ESE students, IEP Meetings, Teacher liason, LEA, School based Team Leader, ASD support
Rice, Traci	Teacher, K-12	SAI Teacher, Interventionist, MTSS Leader, Scheduling of the low 25%
Lessne, Dahlia	School Counselor	School counselor, school success groups, mentoring program, SEL Leader
Anderson, Luisa	School Counselor	ESOL School counselor, school success groups, parent liason, Swpbs Leader
Bickler, Beth	Teacher, K-12	RTI tier 3 instructor and PLC Leader
Bell, Naomi	Other	Behavior Health Professional- Student emotional Support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Monique Coyle

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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 (70%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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 .	

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	109	124	118	131	155	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	778
Attendance below 90 percent	24	19	14	10	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	47	49	52	41	28	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in Math	20	30	36	27	29	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
FY20 ELA Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	36	31	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
FY20 Math Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	24	23	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	26	32	31	28	24	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	1	1	0	2	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/19/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	127	118	119	152	145	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	816
Attendance below 90 percent	27	16	13	13	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	58	53	50	62	41	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	19	11	5	26	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	1	1	2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	127	118	119	152	145	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	816
Attendance below 90 percent	27	16	13	13	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	58	53	50	62	41	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	19	11	5	26	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	1	1	2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	58%	57%	74%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	63%	58%	70%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	56%	53%	61%	55%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	76%	68%	63%	75%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	68%	62%	62%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	59%	51%	44%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	51%	53%	66%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	54%	19%	58%	15%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	62%	14%	58%	18%
	2018	71%	58%	13%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	69%	59%	10%	56%	13%
	2018	74%	59%	15%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	65%	7%	62%	10%
	2018	74%	63%	11%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	67%	10%	64%	13%
	2018	67%	63%	4%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	68%	65%	3%	60%	8%
	2018	78%	66%	12%	61%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	51%	8%	53%	6%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	54	64	61	48	61	57	38				
ELL	64	70	68	63	77	67	57				
ASN	80			87							
BLK	48	63		52	53		62				
HSP	76	69	55	74	73	61	65				
MUL	86			93							
WHT	81	78	73	80	78	61	69				
FRL	65	65	53	66	69	63	54				
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	42	59	59	44	55	45	41				
ELL	67	89	84	61	71	62	68				
ASN	80	60		80	70						
BLK	69	71	64	63	81	80	43				
HSP	74	80	80	74	70	53	70				
MUL	67			89							
WHT	76	75	56	75	69	48	66				
FRL	69	76	69	65	65	53	58				
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	36	57	59	44	47	50	30				
ELL	45	59	58	60	69	50	33				
ASN	67	83		80	67						
BLK	48	85	83	52	40	50					

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
HSP	71	69	65	73	62	53	66				
MUL	60			90							
WHT	82	69	47	80	65	33	78				
FRL	63	63	60	65	62	51	50				

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	72
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	69
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	90
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 Learning gains of the Lowest 25% among grades 4 and 5 was at 60%. This is down 12% from FY18.

Science achievement was 59% This is down 6% from FY18. Science performance is consistently low showing a trend in our school.

FY20

Progress has been hindered because we feel that the district modules do not encompass the full intent of the standard. Our data shows that 3rd grade ELA dropped as compared to the FY19 FSA from 73% to 72%. Additionally we dropped from Diagnostic FY19 to diagnostic FY20 from 74.8 to 72%.

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

Grade 4 and 5 ELA Learning gains showed the greatest decline. Learning gains of the Lowest 25% went down 12% from FY18.

FY20

Progress has been hindered because we feel that the district modules do not encompass the full intent of the standard. Our data shows that 3rd grade ELA dropped as compared to the FY19 FSA from 73% to 72%. Additionally we dropped from Diagnostic FY19 to diagnostic FY20 from 74.8 to 72%.

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 showed the biggest gap. The state average was 57% and the school average was 77%. The gap was 20%

Providing skill/strategy groups based on data as well as matching interventions to student need contributed to this gap.

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

Math Learning gains of the lowest 25% percent showed the most Improvement increasing from 54% to 62%. This is a trend. This area has increase over the last 4 years.

Additionally, FY20 ELA iReady data showed significant growth as compared to FY19 school-wide. Overall the growth went from 68% FY19- 76% FY21. This might have been attributed to inconsistent test taking due to distance learning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students in grade 3,4,5 with 2 or more EWS indicators are 25% or above.

Students missing 10% or more of school days is reflective in their data results.

Based on this data trend our focus is to increase learning gains and achievement for all grades in addition to focusing on the needs of our students with disabilities. Our data shows that a focus on literacy that includes remediation of standards and foundational skills through small group strategy groups, while scaffolding instruction that meets the full intent and rigor of standards in all content areas will improve student achievement.

SWD students will be targeted through various modes of instruction, including technology, small group, Fine Arts intervention groups, technology programs, tutorials, data chats and student monitoring.

Attendance rate is important because students are more likely to succeed in academics when they attend school consistently. In addition to falling behind academically, students who miss school on a regular basis are more likely to be disconnected from the culture of the school. This negatively affects their social and emotional growth towards future success. We will target students with excessive absenteeism through SBT. We will implement district initiatives as well as plans for students that are missing more than 10% of school days. We have developed a flow chart for staff to follow to notify parents and offer strategies to families to increase attendance.

At SSES we develop student engagement and participation towards 100% attendance through various incentives and recognition by the principal, etc.

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

At SSES we are very strategic and collaboratively work together to ensure success for all our students. Our improvement priorities are:

1. ELA achievement in 3rd grade has been stagnant at 72% for 4 years.
2. Math achievement in 3rd grade has been stagnant at 72% for 4 years
3. Science has been low for 5 years. We decreased by 6% in achievement in FY19
4. Learning gains of the Lowest 25% decreased by 12% in FY19

* Our core instruction based on Florida Standards and the Test Item Specifications will be planned through backwards design in our PLC meetings.

Reflection: We have done a very good job planning through backward design in our PLC meetings. The district units do not fully encompass the standards and test item specifications and teachers have had to build in lessons to meet the standard. This has not been effective. Instead we have decided to use our iReady book as part of our core in conjunction with the district modules. This resource does meet the standards.

* We will use multiple data sources data to identify students performing below grade level.

Reflection: We have consistently used multiple data sources to identify students performing below grade level. RR data, iReady data, diagnostic data as well as FSQ/USA data is used to identify these students and provide support. FY21 we have Razkids to provide additional data for us to use.

*Use a variety research-based interventions (LLI, Spire, Foundations, IReady toolkit, etc.) as determined by the decision tree to target areas of specific weakness. Match student need to interventions. Utilize support staff to provide additional interventions during fine arts time.

Reflection:

We have purchased a number of research-based interventions such as Spire, Wilson, LLI, MindPlay, Seeing Stars, Rewards, etc. We have collaborated through MTSS and in leadership meetings to match the student to an intervention that will target their specific area of need.

*Plan differentiated, small group instruction Using a double down approach in conjunction with support staff. We had a day to desegregate our data with a district specialist and we spent time planning our small groups to target standards that were not mastered.

Reflection: We continuously analyze data in PLC meetings. We have separate PLC's for our support staff so they can target standards that students have not mastered. We have worked with our master schedule to provide double down in the classroom. We have also worked with our support staff to provide small group instruction through Fine Arts as well. WE will utilize technology to bring students together through GoogleMeets.

*Monitor progress regularly and revise instruction accordingly.

Reflection: We continuously monitor instruction and progress through FSQ/USA and RR data

biweekly through our PLC meetings. WE also will use Razkids data as well iReady diagnostic and district diagnostic to determine whether students are making growth towards their goals. If students are not making progress, we change the resources and students groups and possibly the instructor. Interventions may need to change at that time.

*Students will be provided support through additional Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.
Reflection: We have a fully functioning MTSS team. We track student progress based on the course of interventions. We make decisions as a team and match the students to interventions. We are able to provide additional interventions in different areas of the day. Sometimes in our Functional Basic skills block and sometimes during Fine Arts.

*After school tutorial

Reflection:

We provide afterschool tutorial as well as morning tutorial to grade 3-5 students. We open the computer labs in the mornings for students to work on their computer programs. We offer students math tutorial through Fine Arts as well. This may be more challenging this year due to Covid, but we are planning to utilize Google Meets to reach more students and bring students into groups even when they are distance learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we deliver differentiated, rigorous standards-based instruction in 3rd grade, then we will increase reading proficiency by 5%. From 73% to 78%. Through data analysis, we determined that our third grade achievement level has been stagnant for 4 years. Although we went up 1% in FY 19 we have not made significant gains to align with the strategic plan goal. By focusing on this area we will increase student achievement and meet our long term outcome.

Measurable Outcome: Third grade reading achievement will increase 5% in FY21; moving from 73% in FY19 to 78% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Coletto (stephanie.coletto@palmbeachschools.org)

* Professional Learning Communities to support the core instruction based on Florida Standards and the Test Item Specifications will be planned through backwards design in our PLC meetings.

Evidence-based Strategy: * Tier 1 & Tier 2 interventions utilizing research-based interventions. Use a variety research-based interventions (LLI, Spire, Foundations, IReady toolkit, etc.) as determined by the decision tree to target areas of weakness.

* Small Group differentiate instruction. Plan differentiated, small group instruction Using a double down approach in conjunction with support staff. Monitor progress regularly and revise instruction accordingly.

* Professional Learning Communities are dedicated to unpacking standards to ensure that teachers are aligned with their core and small group instructions to support all learners. PLCs allow for teachers to collaborate and learn from each other. They also allow students to add their perspectives and interpretation of the depth of standards and plan rigorous lessons and tasks for students using complex text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: *Tiering students helps us understand what are the strengths and areas of improvements our students need. The goal is to close the achievement gaps by targeting foundational skills and strategies and support their improvement journey towards grade level achievements and standards mastery.

* Small group instruction ensures students are given the additional support they need to achieve at their level, through both remediation and enrichment. It allows for continuous sustained progress monitoring and allows teachers to deliver instruction and observe students more closely.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC's will take place weekly (one with a facilitator and one with grade level)
 - a. Plan core instruction through backwards design using modules, test specs, standards and data
 - b. Use only vetted resources to plan for effective and relevant instruction and ensure that all materials are rigorous and relevant.
 - c. Conduct PLC meetings with support staff to discuss strategies, interventions and resources to ensure the use of complex text, task and talk.
 - d. Conduct data chats with all teachers to identify students and action plan and then ongoing progress monitoring to ensure our plan is improving achievement.

e. Monitoring will occur through attendance of PLCs by administration. Lesson plan review and student data analysis as well as data chats (AP, PLC Leader).

Person Responsible Stephanie Coletto (stephanie.coletto@palmbeachschools.org)

2. Tiering of students will begin in August and monitored throughout the year using data.
 - a. Review and analyze data to identify students areas of weakness and needs and progress monitor regularly.
 - b. Identify staff who will offer additional support/remediation and scheduling availability.
 - c. Adjust interventions and instruction based on various data measures at intervals throughout the year .
 - d. Progress monitor small group instruction based on student need as determined through consistent assessment data and observation.
 - e. Leadership along with resource team meet to make decisions on students progress and needs to provide extra support through tier 2 and 3 interventions by qualified staff as determined by the decision tree.
 - f. Monitoring occurs through data analysis of various assessment measures(AP, SAI, Guidance, Resource).

Person Responsible Stephanie Coletto (stephanie.coletto@palmbeachschools.org)

3. Small group Instruction
 - a. Teachers analyze data through PLC's and team meetings utilizing a variety of measures; FSQs, USAs, iReady, RRR, District Diagnostics, etc.
 - b. Teachers group the students based on commonalities and needs.
 - c. Teachers determine whether students need foundational skills, guided reading and, or skills groups.
 - d. Teachers plan their instruction for groups utilizing research-based strategies on predetermined skills.
 - e. Teachers utilize on-going formative assessments such as RR, FSQ/USA, Razkids, iReady diag., District Diag, etc to modify instruction.
 - f. Monitoring will occur through administrative data chats and developing action plans, progress monitoring using data from multiple assessments and Administrator's participation of PLCs.

Person Responsible Stephanie Coletto (stephanie.coletto@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

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 participate in activities and studies about:

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.

Sandpiper Shores Elementary 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 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. We will promote a positive and supportive school climate that promotes the social emotional and academic development of all students. We will develop Social Emotional learning and infuse kindness and tolerance in our curriculum through SEL and Morning Meeting using district curriculum which educates children on being kind to themselves and others and contributing to society so they can make a positive impact in their community and world. We will promote a single school culture in which all staff and students are kind, accepting and tolerant of each other.

Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is an important focus for this school year. As it is necessary to begin our school year in the virtual setting it is vital to practice daily SEL activities to create that classroom community feeling our students crave. Our teachers are prepared with morning meetings to gauge the emotional temperature of students while practicing active listening. Teachers will also have opportunities during teacher led PE to engage in SEL. SEL is easily integrated into the curriculum and we are committed to making sure students are emotionally ready to learn. In addition, there will be Google forms sent to parents which will help us identify challenges the students may be facing to offer the best services possible and increase teacher parent communication. Feelings check-ins will also be sent to each student, by grade level, ongoing throughout the year. Our Care team professionals will review the data and contact any students and families that need attention. We will be offering small groups and whole group lessons to help create a caring community.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is an important focus for this school year. As it is necessary to begin our school year in the virtual setting it is vital to practice daily SEL activities to create that classroom community feeling our students crave. Our teachers are prepared with morning meetings to gauge the emotional temperature of students while practicing active listening. Teachers will also have opportunities during teacher led PE to engage in SEL. SEL is easily integrated into the curriculum and we are committed to making sure students are emotionally ready to learn. In addition, there will be Google forms sent to parents which will help us identify challenges the students may be facing to offer the best services possible and increase teacher parent communication. Feelings check-ins will also be sent to each student, by grade level, ongoing throughout the year. Our Care team professionals will review the data and contact any students and families that need attention. We will be offering small groups and whole group lessons to help create a caring community.

Newsletters to the staff and families are sent out weekly at first and then monthly to keep parents in the loop with all the pertinent information regarding their kids and the school. Good news is shared through these newsletters as well as a principal message through video or a written message.

Shining Stars are given to students and staff to recognize achievements and good citizenship. Students are recognized on a bulletin board as well as on the morning announcements.

Teacher Recognitions in the form of teacher of the month with lunch and a parking space. Small gifts such as candy bars and other things are left in their mailboxes monthly. Admin brings in breakfast or a food truck for staff to enjoy to boost morale.

PTO Facebook page displays pictures from school events and communications. They have a membership drive and hold events to bring families to the school. This year they plan to hold virtual events due to Covid-19

SAC Meetings occur monthly to communicate school events and help with decision making affecting the school to the families and community.

ESOL and Portuguese Parent nights are offered 3 times per year to build community with our ELL families. Additionally, a cyber security parent night is planned to help parents keep their kids safe online.

Clubs on a variety of topics such as a girls run club to promote gender equality and empowerment, a cooking, writing, sports, music, Science, etc clubs are offered to provide a variety of enrichment to our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$939.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
5000	120-Classroom Teachers	1961 - Sandpiper Shores Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	853.44	\$939.00	
		<i>Notes: All money will be utilized towards programs or processes to support student achievement and student improvement.</i>				
Total:					\$939.00	