Addison Mizner School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Addison Mizner School

199 SW 12TH AVE, Boca Raton, FL 33486

https://ames.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Nancy Holly

Start Date for this Principal: 10/4/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	31%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (74%)
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

Addison Mizner School

199 SW 12TH AVE, Boca Raton, FL 33486

https://ames.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	29%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

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.

Addison Mizner 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.

Addison Mizner envisions creating an innovative, collaborative community of learners where all students are given the opportunity for equity and access to achieve their highest academic potential. We further want to ensure all students receive a balanced and rigorous curriculum in a safe environment to able to make well-reasoned, thoughtful, and healthy life-long decisions in an ever-changing world.

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
Davidow, Joshua	Principal	As principal of Addison Mizner Elementary school, Mr. Davidow supervises and monitors all facets of the educational program. His number one priority is to be the instructional leader of the school. He ensures there is equity and access for all students so they all the same opportunities to increase their academic success. He ultimately decides the masterboard schedule, teacher evaluation, and supervision, Palm Beach Model of Instruction, Profesional Development, Professional Learning Communities coordination, hiring of new staff, and budgetary decisions. Additional responsibilities are listed below: * Assistant Principal supervision * Coaching and mentoring teachers * Deliberate practice for all instructional staff * School Advisory Council * School Safety * School/Community Facilitation * Marzano framework implementation * Consistent parent communication
Boone, Joe	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal of Addison Mizner Elementary School, Dr. Boone supports Mr. Davidow with the educational program. As an instructional leader, he conducts walkthroughs to oversee the implementation of differentiated instruction in each classroom. He monitors the teacher use of FSQs and USAs to support struggling students and monitor student results. He coordinates the testing calendar, procedures, and protocols. He is the decision-maker with regards to the safety committee School-Wide Positive Support, and the new teacher mentoring program. Additionally, he monitors discipline in the classroom and tracks number of referrals.
Parkinson, Renee	Teacher, ESE	As ESE coordinator of Addison Mizner Elementary School, Rennee Parkinson ensures students that are struggling move through the SBT process with fidelity. She conducts weekly SBT meetings to talk through students' needs and ensure they move through the tier process easily She collects analyzes the tier II and III data to see if the implementation of the intervention is effective. Additionally, she holds compliant IEP meetings with the necessary stakeholders to ensure students are receiving necessary accommodation and goals to make give them access to an equitable education.
Seiger, Randi	School Counselor	Randi Seiger utilizes the Sanford Harmony curriculum, to teach social and emotional learning through the Fine Arts weekly rotational block. She also uses Suite 360 to teach standards in accordance with the Policy . Additionally, she is the 504 coordinator. She meets with parents in a compliant 504 meeting to discuss the student's needs and address necessary accommodations to make the student successful in and out of the classroom. Finally, she meets with small groups weekly to work with students mental, social and emotional health to support academic growth.
Lamprecht, Lori	Teacher, K-12	As the SAI teacher for Addison Mizner Elementary, Lori Lamprecht works with the struggling readers primarily in grades 1-3. She monitors the iReady usage

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		in the school. She is an active participant in the SBT meetings. Additionally, she works with tier 3 students to ensure the targeted intervention is completed and aligned with the student's goals.
Harrington, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	As the ELL Contact for Addison Mizner Elementary, Margaret Harrington collaborates with general education teachers to create goals and interventions for individual students. She facilitates the WIDA annually to ELL students. She monitors ELL student's progress using formative and summative assessments. Additionally, she pushes into the general education classroom to support the students with the standards.
Dlugos, Shantel	Teacher, K-12	As an ESE teacher, SAC Chair for Addison Mizner, Shantel Dlugos works collaboratively with the general education teachers to ensure student's accommodations are met and their goals are addressed daily. She is also the SAC chair and communicates during SAC monthly SAC with parents, teachers, and the community to update stakeholders and address the needs of the school. Additionally, she works with the alignment of testing. She creates testing schedules for all testing subject areas and grades. She ensures the needs of all students with supplemental learning plans are met in the testing setting.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 10/4/2018, Nancy Holly

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	31%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (74%)
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	135	130	133	127	128	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	811
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	4	6	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	10	11	12	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	3	1	6	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	32	31	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
FY20 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	15	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	3	7	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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 7/29/2020

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	144	141	138	165	146	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	885
Attendance below 90 percent	12	4	9	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	20	17	23	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	1	2	11	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	0	4	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	144	141	138	165	146	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	885
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	4	6	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	20	17	23	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	3	7	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	81%	56%	61%	84%	46%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	76%	58%	59%	68%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	55%	54%	63%	50%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	87%	53%	62%	85%	43%	58%
Math Learning Gains	73%	55%	59%	64%	48%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	52%	52%	64%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	77%	45%	56%	77%	41%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	75%	78%	0%	67%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**									**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	54%	21%	58%	17%
	2018	84%	56%	28%	57%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	62%	20%	58%	24%
	2018	78%	58%	20%	56%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	80%	59%	21%	56%	24%
	2018	85%	59%	26%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	65%	20%	62%	23%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	94%	67%	27%	64%	30%
	2018	84%	63%	21%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	82%	65%	17%	60%	22%
	2018	90%	66%	24%	61%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	100%	60%	40%	55%	45%
	2018	100%	56%	44%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-100%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	51%	26%	53%	24%
	2018	84%	56%	28%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	45	60	48	65	72	66	39				
ELL	63	92	88	89	77	92	73				
ASN	80			100							
BLK	62			77							
HSP	78	78	76	78	73	60	61				
MUL	76	75		90	50						
WHT	83	75	62	91	75	83	82				
FRL	71	74	68	78	72	70	60				

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	48	46	42	55	56	48	65				
ELL	58	56	55	68	75	70					
ASN	100	100		100	91						
HSP	81	60	46	84	75	68	80				
MUL	88	73		88	64						
WHT	84	69	61	87	74	74	86				
FRL	74	61	55	79	67	69	74				

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	54	63	46	53	48	38	47				
ELL	67	73		75	73						
HSP	82	70	63	82	63	67	75				
MUL	88			76							
WHT	84	66	61	86	64	63	77				
FRL	77	71	59	78	66	80	60				

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	77
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	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	617
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	82
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	90
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	70
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	72
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	73
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	80
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	72
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.

When looking at our subgroup data from FY19, our English Language Arts in grades 3-5 declined by 3%. Our math achievement stayed the same at 87% proficiency. Science proficiency declined by 7%. Our subgroup data is indicating that SWD ELA achievement declined by 3%. However, SWD math achievement increased by 10%. This is a trend because historically this group has the lowest in ELA achievement, but has excelled in math.

During the midyear, this is further supported when comparing the FY19 FSA proficiency to FY20 winter diagnostic in both ELA and math. The ELA proficiency for the FY20 diagnostic decreased by 2% compared to 2019 FSA. The math proficiency increased by 3% comparing the FY19 FSA to the FY20 diagnostic. Furthermore, analyzing the midyear FY20 iReady data, we see our students are making progress. We have comparison data from window 1 to 2.

iReady 2: 3rd - 47% (+17% from W1); 4th - (+13% from W1); 5th - (+9% from W1)

Due to the lack of data for FY20 because of state-mandated school closure (Covid19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue with our FY20 goals for FY21.

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

Our greatest decline was English Language Arts proficiency by 3%. The factors that contributed to this decline were 3rd grade ELA decreased by 9% and 5th grade ELA decreased by 5%. Math proficiency stayed the same, math learning gains and the lowest 25% math learning gains decreased by 1%.

Our mid-year FY20 District's Winter Diagnostic:
* ELA: -0.1 pts. in Grade 3; -0.91 pts. in Grade 4; -6.48 pts. in Grade 5
ESSA-SWD (-2.7% ELA); SWD (+18.5% Math)

FY20 Winter Diagnostic to FY19 Winter Diagostic:
* Math: +3.74 pts. in Grade 3; -4.13 pts. in Grade 4; +5.04 pts. in Grade 5
During PLCs, there was an intense focus on establishing rigor during small group lessons. Teachers collaborated to disaggregate the data from formative assessments and create focussed small group instruction to remediate, reteach, or enrich students. Within the learning communities, grade-level teams built capacity and ensured all students received an equitable and accessible instruction needed to be successful especially targeting our ESSA groups.

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.

In comparison to the state, our school has experienced increased achievement in all areas:
ELA +24% achievement
* ELA Learning Gains +18%
* ELA Lowest 25% + 14%
* Math +24% achievement
* Math Learning Gains +11%
* Math Lowest 25% +21%
* Science achievement +24%
The factors that affect our overall greater achievement than the state is that teachers use PLCs to collaborate on lessons, analyze data to drive their instruction, and remediate student's areas of need.

Mid-year 2020 data in iReady window 2, we see our students are making positive gains. We have comparison data from window 1 to window 2.
iReady 2: 3rd - 47% (+17% from W1); 4th - (+13% from W1); 5th - (+9% from W1)

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

The area that demonstrated the most improvement was with ELA learning gains. Our lowest 25 increased by 10% from 57% to 67%. Our learning gains increased by 7% from 69% to 76%.
In FY19 we focused primarily on planned Professional Learning Communities where teachers collaborated together to ensure their lessons were strategic and focused on all student's needs to create an equitable education.
Looking at our grade level data, 4th grade increased 4% in ELA compared to last year's 4th graders. The 5th-grade cohort increased by 2% in ELA. In math, 4th grade increased 10% compared to last year's 4th graders and the cohort increased by 12%.

Our mid-year FY20 District's Winter Diag:
* Math: + 3.74 points in Grade 3, +5.04 points in Grade 5
ESSA - SWD (+18.5% Math) Hispanic (+5.9)

FY20 Winter Diagnostic vs. FY19 Diagostic
* Math: +3.74 pts. in Grade 3; +5.04 pts. in Grade 5

In FY 20 we focused on maximizing time during PLCs. Teachers focused on deliberate instruction including standards alignment, modeling, coaching, and data analysis to help build teacher capacity to ensure all students are receiving an equitable education and accessible for all ESSA subgroups. Additionally, we continued a rotational model in math to target students all to remediate, reteach, or enrich standards.

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

When looking at Early Warning Systems, one potential area of concern is the number of students with course failures in ELA and math. This is indicative of students not meeting grade-level standards. If students are not passing courses, then they will not pass state-level assessments, therefore, causing the achievement gap to widen year after year. This concern can be addressed by ensuring these students are referred to the School-Based Team. If the meetings are held in a timely manner and students move through the tier process consistently using research-based interventions are used, data can be reviewed, recommendations can be made for students to be referred for testing. If this happens in a timely manner, these students will receive the extra support needed to close the achievement gap.

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

At Addison Mizner Elementary, our primary focus is to nurture student's social-emotional growth while enriching students with a rigorous and balanced curriculum. We believe that if we commit our time to our students we will ensure an equitable and equal opportunity for all students while positively shaping:
* Increasing positive self-esteem
* Building leadership Skills
* Increasing rigor
* Monitoring progress
* Increasing motivation
Our priorities are:

1. ESSA Subgroups: Maximize support for students during small group rotations to focus on their instructional needs. Ensure the masterboard allows for resource teachers to push into classrooms and help our SWD and ELL students. By using the double down strategy students will have opportunities to meet twice daily with the general education teacher and resource and/or support teacher to ensure equity and access for all students. By giving students equal opportunities to succeed all opportunities available. all students are focused on instruction based on their needs.
2. ELA Achievement: This ensures students are reading on grade level by third grade and is in alignment LTO #1 increase reading on grade level by the third grade, and LTO #2 Ensure High School Readiness. Furthermore, this will also Increase the overall ELA proficiency for grades 3-5 and progress for ESSA subgroups (SWDs & ELLs).
3. FUNdations: Ensuring a 30-minute block of time is in the masterboard for grades K-2 to increase phonemic awareness, fluency, spelling, and vocabulary development. This will ensure reading proficiency in grades 3-5.
4. Afterschool tutorial: Form afterschool tutorial groups to remediate students on areas of weaknesses after analyzing the mid-year diagnostics.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To ensure progress towards student achievement in ELA to align with the District's Strategic Plan; LTO #1; increase reading on grade level by third grade; and LTO #2 Ensure High School Readiness. Based on FY19 state data our overall ELA data is 81% which is down 3%. When looking at ELA performance by grade, only fourth grade increased (+3%), while third decreased (-8%) and fifth grade (-5%). However, our ELA learning gains increased by 7% from 69% to 76%, and our ELA L25 percentile increased by 10% from 57% to 67%. ESSA data shows SWD (57 ESSA points); ELL (82 ESSA points); and Hispanic (72 ESSA points) are meeting the required federal threshold of the 41 percentage points. During midyear, our Diagnostic data demonstrated a decrease of 2% in ELA. Our ESSA groups decreased slightly as well. Hispanics -1%; SWD - 3%; and ELL -15%. Although it was a slight decrease in percentage, this data demonstrates we need to plan and deliver small group rigorous, instruction tailored to our student's needs. Due to the lack of data for FY20 because of state-mandated school closure (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue with our FY20 goal for FY21, although our midyear diagnostic decreased slightly, the iReady window 2 data shows our students are making continuous improvements.
Measurable Outcome:	Our measurable goal for FY21 will be to increase ELA third grade proficiency by ten points to result in 85% ELA proficiency. During the midyear, we saw a 0.10 point increase from 75.47% to 75.57%% in ELA. Reviewing this data shows we need to revise some of our strategies from last year and remain focused on our target. For the last trimester of FY20, our students were taught through distance learning. Due to the lack of data for FY20 because of state-mandated school closure (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue with our FY20 goal for FY21, however, when analyzing the iReady window 2 data shows our students are on track to making improvements in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Davidow (joshua.davidow@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Differentiated small-Group instruction will be utilized in ELA. Through differentiation, students will receive the targeted instruction to enrich, reteach, or remediate. 2. The Double down strategy will be used during the ELA block to target high needs learners. Students will receive small targeted instruction twice a day in literacy block. 3. Afterschool Tutors will facilitate ELA tutorials to ensure academic success. The groups will be created after looking at the mid-year diagnostic data to group students based on their strengths and weaknesses. 4. Students will engage in adaptive technology to offer personalized learning solutions to support/enrich/remediate (iReady and Raz-Plus) 5. Intervention strategies will be utilized for students that need a personalized approach to their learning. (Level Literacy Intervention (LLI), FUNdations, and iReady Tools)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Small-group Differentiated instruction creates an equitable culture within the classroom so all students have an opportunity to be successful and make progress toward proficiency with the standard. 2. The Double Down Strategy supports our ESSA groups by ensuring our students receive small group instruction twice a day during the literacy block. 3. Tutorials ensure student's differentiated needs are met outside the school day in a rotational model of instruction, reteaching, remediation, and acceleration.

4. IReady offers support to students reading skill levels based on their diagnostic given three times a year. Raz-Plus gives students opportunities to strengthen their reading skills and learn strategies to develop their fluency and comprehension.

5. FUNdations instructs students on phonemic awareness, decoding, spelling, and vocabulary development. Leveled Literacy Interventions gives students opportunities to work in small groups while engaging in leveled books. Raz-Plus offers guided reading lessons for students to use to increase proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Small-Group Differentiated ELA Instruction:
a. Teachers will disaggregate data to determine strengths and weaknesses in ELA.
b. Teachers will create a small group rotational model based on student's needs with proper supports.
c. Teachers will use a variety of modalities and methodologies to assist with instruction for all learners.
d. Teachers will use formative assessments to track student progress.
e. The principal will monitor the small group lesson plans and data analysis (Joshua Davidow).

Person Responsible   Joshua Davidow (joshua.davidow@palmbeachschools.org)

2. Double Down Strategy:
a. Leadership will create a master board schedule that will include specific times for support fasciliators and resource teachers to push into classrooms to support students with areas of needs.
b. Teachers and support fasciliators will analyze data to create groups for high needs students so both teachers work with them twice daily.
c. Teachers will work collaboratively to plan lessons to target student's needs that have a supplemental education plan.
d. Teachers will track student progress and monitor/adjust lessons based on student's needs.
e. The ESE coordinator will monitor the resource teacher schedule, lesson plans, and data analysis (Renee Parkinson.

Person Responsible   Renee Parkinson (renee.parkinson@palmbeachschools.org)

3. Afterschool Tutoring:
a. After midyear diagnostic/formative assessments, grade 3-5 teachers will disaggregate the data to determine students that need remediation in certain standards.
b. Tutoring groups will be formed within each grade level. Tutoring will be offered to enrich and remediate students to meet their targeted FSA goals.
c. Teachers will create engaging lessons to keep the attention of students after school while still meeting the student's needs.
d. Teachers will monitor student's progress using quick formative assessments.
e. Monitoring will occur through rigor walks and ongoing student data (Shantel Dlugos)

Person Responsible   Shantel Dlugos (shantel.dlugos@palmbeachschools.org)

4. Adaptive Technology (iReady and Raz-Kids):
a. Provide teachers with professional development to assist with the facilitation of the program.
b. Teachers will provide students with a rotational model to ensure all students have access to the programs.
c. Teachers will adjust student's levels based on the results from the adaptive technology.
d. Teachers will engage students in small group instruction based on adaptive technology results.
e. Assistant Principal will monitor technology usage/pass rate (Joe Boone).

Person Responsible   Joe Boone (joe.boone@palmbeachschools.org)

5. Intervention Strategies (FUNdations, LLI, and iReady Toolkit):
a. Resource teachers will create a schedule by working with the general education teacher to further support students with researched intervention strategies.
b. Resource teachers will deliver intervention strategies daily based on student's data.
c. Resource teachers will track student progress. Lori Lamprecht, the SAI teacher, will monitor the data and report it to the SBT coordinator (Lori Lamprecht).

Person Responsible   Lori Lamprecht (lori.lamprecht@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan and with the goal to increase academic instruction of all students - Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards including the content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a Single School Culture of excellence in Academics, behavior, and climate with an appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. policy 2.09 with a focus on the instruction of the:
(a) History of the Holocaust,
(b) History of Africans and African Americans
(c) Study of the contributions of Hispanics
(d) Study of Women contributions
(e) Sacrifices of Veterans in serving our country.

Additional content required instruction by Florida Statute 1003.42(2), as applicable to appropriate grade levels include,
- Declaration of Independence
- Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights
- Character Development program with curriculum to address: responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect; caring; and fairness.

This content is integrated and delivered through the English Language Arts block. Teachers collaborate during Professional Learning Communities to ensure content is delivered with validity.

Our school integrates a Single School Culture using the Universal Guidelines for Success following the Behavior Matrix using the (STAR) where students are responsible, respectful, and ready to learn., Teachers will articulate, demonstrate, and teach the specific practices that reflect the application of the school's SwPBS universal guidelines. Adults across the campus will clarify their expectations for positive interpersonal interaction and create the structures for a single school culture of excellence.

In accordance with FLDOE Rules, 6A-1.094122, F.A.C and Rule 6A-1.094123, F.A.C., our school implements Suite 360 into the guidance curriculum during Fine Arts rotation. These lessons are taught using the Suite 360 curriculum using the smartboard in a whole group or individually through their portal on the computer. These lessons are recorded and documented.

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.

At Addison Mizner, we strive to ensure our faculty and staff have the opportunity to build capacity centered around a structured, collaborative Professional Learning Community setting. Social-emotional learning is at the foundation of the student's learning. Focusing on a growth mindset and building relationships with adults and peers is the foundation for creating a nurturing environment for students. Students at our school take ownership of their learning and value their academic success. They know our teachers put forth the effort and want to see them succeed. Our school builds solid partnerships with parents/guardians. The membership in both SAC/PTA is solid and increasing each year. There is open communication between the school and the stakeholders. The correlation between parents and staff is positive. It is evident with the number of donations and volunteer hours that are logged in annually. Parents take an interest in their student's education and look for ways to support their learning at home. Our parents always take the time to attend parent informative night(s) throughout the year. Furthermore, business partners show their support by donating money and time for the good of the school. The principal builds positive relationships with stakeholders. He consistently listens intently to the voice of the stakeholders and addresses their concerns in a timely manner. Additionally, he communicates by emailing a weekly update regarding pertinent school news, upcoming events, and opportunities.

Shared decisions making is evident with SAC monthly meetings where stakeholders discuss and vote how the school will best serve the needs of each student to foster an equitable education. During PLCs, leaders discuss the student's needs. Collaboratively teachers plan using the Florida standards to build cohesive lessons that reteach, remediate, and enrich students. Our teachers take pride in our student's learning and aim for success.

The School-Wide Positive support team meets monthly to provide incentives to students who act as role models and promote equity and fairness to others. Class rewards are given in the cafeteria for promoting a positive attitude and citizenship.

Character Development is taught during fine arts rotation in guidance. The curriculum consists of patriotism, responsibility, citizenship, kindness, respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty, charity, self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation. In accordance with FLDOE Rules, 6A-1.094122, F.A.C and Rule 6A-1.094123, F.A.C., our school implements Suite 360 is also integrated into the Suite 360. Topics include youth substance abuse, abuse health education, and child trafficking protection, and awareness. The lessons are taught using the Suite 360 curriculum and presented using the smartboard in a whole group or individually through their portal on the computer. These lessons are recorded and documented.

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: ELA				$928.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	1451 - Addison Mizner School	School Improvement Funds	843.22	$928.00
					Total:	$928.00