

The School District of Palm Beach County

Forest Park Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Forest Park Elementary School

1201 SW 3RD ST, Boynton Beach, FL 33435

<https://fpes.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Sharonda Alleyne

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Forest Park Elementary School

1201 SW 3RD ST, Boynton Beach, FL 33435

<https://fpes.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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Forest Park Elementary aims to develop active, inquiring, and knowledgeable lifelong learners who achieve standards and who make a difference through intercultural understanding and respect.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Forest Park Elementary envisions a dynamic, collaborative, and multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported. Integrative technological modalities assist learners to reach their highest potential and succeed in global outreach, while providing experiences that prepares students to become productive citizens.

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
Robinson, Nancy	Principal	Instructional leader in charge of executing and monitoring personnel, resources, and strategies. To ensure all students have an equitable and accessible opportunity to learn and achieve.
McMillan, Toni	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader that supports the execution and monitoring of personnel, resources, and strategies. To ensure all students have an equitable and accessible opportunity to learn and achieve.
Green, Simone	Administrative Support	Monitor and facilitate International Baccalaureate program implementation. Provide support through the inquiry process for 5th grade science teachers and students.
Davis, Carla	Administrative Support	Monitor for compliance and program implementation of the ESOL program; provides support for ELL students.
Blucher, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Support teachers and students for math instruction in grades 2-5. Lead and facilitate Professional Learning Communities in grades 2-5 to provide standard-based instruction. Provide instructional resources for science for teachers in fifth grade. SAC Chair, lead SIP.
Canton, Jessy	School Counselor	Assist ESOL students to overcome social and emotional challenges as new immigrants in our United States school system.
Beeler, Victoria	Instructional Coach	Support teachers and students for ELA and math instruction in grades K-2. Lead and facilitate Professional Learning Communities in grades K-2 to provide standard-based instruction.
Vaniglia, Cheri	School Counselor	Support students and staff with social and emotional needs, academics and behavior. Support through teaching and facilitating school-based team. Counseling students with social and emotional needs. Lead for social and emotional learning. Monitor and assist with positive behavioral support and attendance concerns.
Banks, Altomese	Instructional Coach	Support teachers and students for ELA instruction in grades 2-5. Lead and facilitate Professional Learning Communities in grades 2-5 to provide standard-based instruction.
Jeantinoble, Rose-Michele	Teacher, K-12	5th grade teacher, Co-Chair for SAC.
Mitchell, Maureen	Teacher, ESE	Facilitate the Child Study Team process. Monitor for compliance and program implementation of the ESE program; provides support for ESE students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/28/2020, Sharonda Alleyne

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.*

5

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	55	84	67	79	75	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	445
Attendance below 90 percent	0	27	23	20	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	7	1	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	37	44	47	41	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
Course failure in Math	0	21	31	33	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	42	44	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	30	24	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	27	36	36	34	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

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	89	71	83	85	84	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	492
Attendance below 90 percent	13	10	9	13	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	11	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA or Math	40	69	52	54	33	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	36	18	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	7	11	10	39	19	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	89	71	83	85	84	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	492
Attendance below 90 percent	13	10	9	13	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	11	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA or Math	40	69	52	54	33	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	36	18	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	7	11	10	39	19	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	55%	58%	57%	34%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	63%	58%	58%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	56%	53%	57%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	68%	63%	51%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	68%	62%	50%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	59%	51%	44%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	51%	53%	40%	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	43%	54%	-11%	58%	-15%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	62%	13%	58%	17%
	2018	44%	58%	-14%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		31%				
Cohort Comparison		35%				
05	2019	45%	59%	-14%	56%	-11%
	2018	33%	59%	-26%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	65%	-7%	62%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	63%	-11%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	67%	2%	64%	5%
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	48%	65%	-17%	60%	-12%
	2018	49%	66%	-17%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	27%	51%	-24%	53%	-26%
	2018	29%	56%	-27%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	28	58	73	29	54	60	19				
ELL	47	70	76	60	67	55	24				
BLK	54	69	67	56	62	50	29				
HSP	56	70		73	70		27				
WHT	69			77							
FRL	54	69	70	61	65	55	31				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	57	60	14	45						
ELL	32	66	72	40	51	56	17				
BLK	44	69	70	49	52	45	31				
HSP	38	59		55	71						
WHT	64			75							
FRL	44	66	73	52	58	56	34				

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	17	43	50	33	52	55	36				
ELL	24	59	61	41	49	42	33				
BLK	31	54	56	47	47	47	33				
HSP	33	63		50	56		50				
WHT	67	82		100	64						
FRL	33	57	58	51	49	45	41				

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	57
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	57
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	57
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	73
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	57
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.

Science data showed the lowest performance: in FY19 we achieved 30%, which was a decline from 34% in FY18. When looking at our subgroup performance we see that our black/African American students declined by 2% and our FRL declined by 3%. Our SWD science achievement was at 19%, currently our lowest performing subgroup. The contributing factors are the students taking the 5th grade science assessment have limited prior knowledge and struggle with the academic vocabulary of the content. The historical data at FPES demonstrates this is a trend in the content that we most struggle with. On our Winter Diagnostic FY20, our science scores increased from 30 to 35%. During FY20 we purchased a special Science program called "Boot Camp" which was utilized to provide teachers with daily reviews. We also continued with small group science which was supported by a resource teacher. Our midyear data demonstrates we were on track to meeting our goals.

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

Our greatest decline from the prior year is our Lowest 25th percentile in ELA. Diagnostic FY19 data shows our students continue to struggle with ELA. Within our math L25s, our data demonstrates a 1% decrease total. However, we have not had significant growth within the last several years. Our ELLs and Free and Reduced lunch had a decline of 1% and our Black/African American students had a decline of 5%. However, our SWDs had an increase from 14% to 28%, a 10% increase and in Math we see an increase from 14% to 29%, a 15% increase.

Overall our Winter Diagnostic FY20 ELA scores decreased by 8% while math and science scores increased by 5% respectively. When looking at the ELA data, we may attribute the decline to developing K-2 capacity prior to entering the tested grades. In FY21 we made teacher changes to ensure our strong teachers are in front of our most needy students. Our coaches will add additional supports to 2nd grade classrooms along with the support provided within 3-5.

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.

When looking at comparison data to the state, we see that we have a positive difference of 17% above the state in our ELA L25s. Our school scored 70% and the state scored 53%. In FY19 we incorporated standard-based, differentiated instruction strategies and planning within the PLC structure. Leadership monitored carefully and provided support as needed. During the FY20 Midyear, according to our iReady Winter Diagnostics:

On grade level for Kindergarten increased by 36% (13% to 49%)

On grade level for First grade increased by 11% (14% to 25%)

On grade level for Second grade increased by 15% (11% to 26%)

On grade level for Third grade increased by 12% (28% to 40%)

We attribute this growth to the Double Down strategy used in K-5. Each classroom teacher has a push-in support of a resource teacher, instructional coach, CLFs, or SSCC. We also utilize the SAI teacher to supplement outside of the ELA block. We will continue to utilize DD during FY21.

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

The content that demonstrated the most improvement from one year to the next was seen in ELA with an 11% increase (FY19 data was 55% and FY18 was 44%). Math showed a 9% increase (FY19 data

was 61%, FY18 was 52%). Our SWDs had an increase from 14% to 28%, a 10% increase in ELA and in Math we see an increase from 14% to 29%, a 15% increase. In FY20 our SWDs were included in the Double Down rotation where they were supported by multiple teachers. The majority fell under our L25% and they received an additional 30 minutes of support daily.

During the FY20 Midyear, according to our iReady Winter Diagnostics:

On grade level for Kindergarten increased by 36% (13% to 49%)

On grade level for First grade increased by 11% (14% to 25%)

On grade level for Second grade increased by 15% (11% to 26%)

On grade level for Third grade increased by 12% (28% to 40%)

Math scores increased from 57% to 62%. The third grade increased by 2%, fourth grade increased by 3% and fifth grade decreased by 2%.

Science increased by 5%, from 30% to 35% in achievement.

We attribute this growth to the Double Down strategy used in K-5 in ELA, Math & Science classrooms. Each classroom teacher has a push-in support of a resource teacher, instructional coach, CLFs, or SSCC. We also utilize the SAI teacher to supplement outside of the ELA block. We will continue to utilize Double Down.

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

Based on this data trend, our focus will be to increase learning gains and achievement for grades 3-5 in addition to focusing on the needs of our students with disabilities. Our data trends show that a focus on literacy and math that includes remediation of standards, foundational skills, and scaffolding instruction that meet the full intent and rigor of standards in all content areas. SWD students will be targeted through various modes of instruction, including technology, small group, tutorials, data chats and student monitoring.

When looking at the EWS data, the two potential areas of concern would be:

Course failure in ELA or Math specifically as it pertains to our primary grades k-2

Students with two or more indicators specifically in grades 3-5

To support learning & improve student progress and achievement we plan to continue with the additional 30 minutes of L25% support and continue with the 30 minute Double Down support in all classrooms. In third grade we plan to offer an additional half hour support of Double Down.

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

1. Improve science achievement within all subgroups, specifically our SWDs...using relevant instructional

materials such as Science Boot Camp and STEMSCOPES.

2. Increase learning gains within the low performing students in math.

3. Maintain positive learning growth within ELA and Math Achievement, ELA and Math gains, and within ELA and Math L25s.

4. Increase student achievement within our primary grades (k-2) as monitored through various data points (adaptive technology, RRRs, FSQ's and USA's).

5. Incorporate Social Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies and resources to support all learners all the time.

To support and ensure success for all students, we plan to offer:

1. Weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): weekly PLCs provide opportunities for data analysis, standard based instructional planning and teacher capacity building. Data Analysis: review previous year's data and most recent local assessment by school, grade level, teacher and student.

We also offer PLCs for our ESE and ESOL teachers.

2. Tutorials: focused on strategic groupings to include L25s in both reading and math, 5th grade science fair game benchmarks, and potential proficiency droppers.

3. Double Down: ESE, ESOL, resource teachers and academic tutors are strategically aligned to provide instructional support during core reading and math, and designated reading intervention courses

4. Adaptive technology (iReady, Imagine Learning, and Success Maker): monitored weekly by teachers and administration to insure usage and performance expectations.

5. Small group differentiated instruction: using data analysis to support the instructional planning to meet the needs of diverse learners.

6. International Baccalaureate Primary Year Program (PYP): promotes inquiry approached learning immersed in the curriculum.

7. Word work, guided reading and reading intervention: Professional Development focuses on the implementation of Foundations, increasing reading proficiency through guided reading and the use of Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI).

For student engagement support we have incorporated SEL in all classroom schedules. Teachers utilize "Morning Meeting" on a daily basis. Guidance focuses on SEL topics throughout the year during the Fine Arts rotation and. we have incorporated SEL lessons during lunch periods in the cafeteria too.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>We are focusing on instructional practices In ELA, Math and Science to meet the district's strategic plan of long term outcomes; high school readiness and increasing reading proficiency of third graders.</p> <p>Our data shows 54% of third graders are reading below grade level. According to the Winter Diagnostics FY20, 52% of 4th graders and 56% of fifth graders are reading below grade level. 79% of ESE third, fourth and fifth grade students are reading below grade level. This is a critical need for improvement. Our ELL data shows 25% of LF's and 69% of LY's are below grade level in 3rd, 4th and 5th. According to our Winter Diagnostic, ELA scores decreased from FSA FY19 To Diag FY20 by 8%. Overall ELA levels in third grade have increased by 2%, fourth grade decreased by 25% and fifth grade had a slight decrease by 2%.</p> <p>Our math data shows 38% of 3rd grade students are below grade level, 29% of 4th grade students are below grade level and 47% of 5th grade students are below grade level according to FY20 Winter Diagnostic scores. Our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade ESE students are 57% below grade level in math. Our ELL data shows 19% of LF's and 49% of LY's are below grade level in 3rd, 4th and 5th. According to our Winter Diagnostic, Math scores increased from FSA FY19 to Diag FY20 from 57% to 62%. The third grade increased by 2%, fourth grade increased by 3% and fifth grade decreased by 2%.</p> <p>Our science data shows 64% of 5th grade students are below grade level. Our Winter Diagnostic FY20 showed an increase of 5% from SSA FY19.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Increase ELA achievement for each grade and subgroups by 5% from 55% on FSA (FY19) to 60% on FSA (FY21).</p> <p>Increase Math achievement for each grade and subgroups by 5% from 61% on FSA (FY19) to 66% on FSA (FY21).</p> <p>Increase science achievement by 10% from 30% on SSA (FY19) to 40% on SSA (FY21). For SWDs, we would like to continue with the growth trend we saw from 2018 to 2019, for FY21 we would like to see an increase of 10% in all areas.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Nancy Robinson (nancy.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning Communities are an opportunity for all our teachers to collaboratively come together on a weekly basis to focus on data analysis, planning for best practices, monitoring, and supporting each other towards established goals to ensure student achievement & improvement. 2. Tutorials ensure students receive remediation and enrichment during the day and after school. 3. Double Down in all content areas in K-5 using resource teachers affords students the opportunity to expand their learning through strategic instruction focused on student needs/abilities. 4. Adaptive technology (i-Ready, Imagine Learning, Success Maker, STEM Scopes, and Mystery Science) offers students personalized instruction in addition to teacher-directed learning. 5. Small group differentiated Instruction allows our students to learn through strategic and streamlined instruction based on their needs. 6. International Baccalaureate Primary Year Program (PYP) encourages students to become global thinkers and incorporate inquiry-based learning strategies.
Rationale for	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) provide educators the opportunities to collaboratively dis-aggregate data, plan standard-based instruction utilizing research based

Evidence-based Strategy:

- practices to implement effective classroom instruction to support all learners.
- 2. Tutorials provide students with additional, targeted support by content experts.
- 3. Double Down using ELL, ESE Resource teachers to support student learning through differentiated instruction utilizing a variety of materials and methods.
- 4. Adaptive technology (i-Ready, Imagine Learning, Success Maker, STEM Scopes, and Mystery Science) allows for personalized instruction to support student growth as remediation and enrichment.
- 5. Small group differentiated instruction allows students to learn with guided support at their pace.
- 6. International Baccalaureate Primary Year Program (PYP) establishes an environment of global learners through research, presentations, writing, and exhibitions to promote independence and develop self esteem.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Professional Learning Communities (PLC).
 - A. Establish weekly schedule to ensure all stakeholders are included.
 - B. Develop agendas utilizing student data, classroom observations and scope and sequence provided by the district.
 - C. Create lesson plans focused on student needs.
 - D. Develop strategies and identify resources and key content and vocabulary that will be taught.
 - D. Monitoring will occur through learning walks, review of lesson plans and student data analysis (Banks, Beeler, Blucher).

Person Responsible Nancy Robinson (nancy.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

- 2. Tutorials
 - A. Identify target student groups based on data
 - B. Employ content area specialist based on data to ensure only expert support
 - C. Develop instructional focus based on student needs
 - D. Monitoring will occur through analysis of student FSQ and USA results. (Beeler, McMillan, Robinson)

Person Responsible Nancy Robinson (nancy.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

- 3. Double Down using resource teachers
 - A. Capacity building through PLCs.
 - B. Establish push in student schedule.
 - C. Identify students and align with corresponding resource teacher (ELL student with ELL teacher).
 - D. Develop instructional focus and strategies to be utilized during small group instruction.
 - E. Monitoring will occur through learning walks, review of lesson plans and student data analysis (Mitchell, Fusco).

Person Responsible Nancy Robinson (nancy.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

- 4. Adaptive technology (i-Ready, Imagine Learning, Success Maker, STEM Scopes, and Mystery Science)
 - A. Establish procedures and expectations for the use of technology during small group instruction.
 - B. Train teachers and students on effective usage of all programs.
 - B. Monitoring through weekly reports and celebrations (AP).

Person Responsible Nancy Robinson (nancy.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

- 5. Small group differentiated instruction
 - A. Teachers utilize resources from adaptive technology to continuously improve student achievement

(during PLC).

B. Develop and implement a focus calendar with secondary benchmarks utilizing Blender and i-Ready Toolbox.

C. Monitoring occurs through learning walks, lesson plan review & data analysis. (Banks, Blucher, and Beeler).

Person Responsible Nancy Robinson (nancy.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

6. International Baccalaureate Primary Year Program (PYP)

A. Choice coordinator meets consistently with grade levels to develop the IB Planners (Transdisciplinary Themes).

B. Scheduling of culminating cultural activities/ research based exhibition.

C. Evidence of success is documented through the uploading of IB planners and through the summative assessments (Green).

Person Responsible Nancy Robinson (nancy.robinson@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 the academic instruction of all students, students are immersed in rigorous task 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 of S.B. policy 2.09 with a focus on the instruction of the

***History of Holocaust;**

***History of African Americans;**

***Study of contributions of Hispanics to the US**

***Study of the contributions of Women to the US, and**

***Sacrifices of Veterans in serving our country.**

Within our school, teachers will articulate, demonstrate, and teach the specific practices that reflect the application of the school's SwPBS universal guidelines of students practicing being responsible, respectful and ready to learn. Adults across the campus will clarify their expectations for positive interpersonal interaction and create the structures for a single school culture of excellence.

At FPES we have established a monitoring system to ensure proper and effective implementation and instruction of the state statutes. Leadership meets monthly discuss the Google Doc created to plan and identify the items being done throughout the school day to comply with the content & curriculum of the statutes.

To recognize our multiple cultures we participate in heritage events that include cultural dances, arts, and food.

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.

As a cohort school for Social Emotional Learning entering our third year, we have fully implemented the CASEL practices of SEL. SEL is all encompassing since we include all stakeholders, teachers, students, parents, and administration. For example, all students are involved in Morning Meeting on a daily basis. For meetings, we incorporate welcoming rituals and optimistic closures.

School wide Positive Behavior Team meets monthly to ensure the consistent implementation of a positive school culture including expectations, rewards, celebrations, and teaching students with feedback. For example, students can earn tiger paws as a daily reward, cafeteria rewards for classrooms, and whole school rewards at least twice a year. Teachers select a student of the month based on demonstration of IB learner traits.

The equity component is being addressed through SEL and as a single school culture all students and teachers are included in decision making process. We ensure equal access to our Math AMP program, as well as other enrichment for our gifted students. Accommodations and services are provided to individuals based on need.

Teachers are becoming involved in district training on Culturally Responsive Teaching and incorporating these strategies in the classroom.

As a 21st Century grant school, we have a 21st century grant director that provides training for parents. Some training opportunities have been homework help, parent conferencing techniques, parenting supports, etc.

We also host a Drama Club based on a Disney Grant. This club works in collaboration with the SAAC program and they culminate the year with a musical.

The IB program allows the opportunity for IB Ambassadors, they get involved with community activities; community clean-up, Boynton Beach Parade, and etc.

Our Cultural Dancers are utilized as a welcome group for parent and community events hosted at our school.

Our Behavioral Health Professional has done wonderful activities to ensure student and parent engagement. He focuses students' self esteem and developing positive relationships to support academics and social/emotional growth.

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	\$548.00
---	--------	---	----------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	0831 - Forest Park Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	498.55	\$548.00
			<i>Notes: Money will be used for programs & processes towards student achievement and progress.</i>			
Total:						\$548.00