

The School District of Palm Beach County

Barton 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

Barton Elementary School

1700 BARTON RD, Lake Worth, FL 33460

<https://brte.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Denise Sanon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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* Native American Students* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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

Barton Elementary School

1700 BARTON RD, Lake Worth, FL 33460

<https://brte.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	98%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

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

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.

Barton Elementary School is committed to ensuring all learners reach their highest potential through an excellent and equitable collaborative community that prepares for college and career readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will be given quality and purposeful instruction, driven by the standards that will result in student proficiency and growth.

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
Johnson, Tara	Assistant Principal	Focus on the goal to increase student academic achievement in all content areas in addition to closing the achievement gap for all students. Building teacher capacity in meeting the needs of all students while building relationships with the community, parents, and business partners to support all of Barton's initiatives.
Sanon, Denise	Principal	Focus on the goal to increase student academic achievement in all content areas in addition to closing the achievement gap for all students. Building teacher capacity in meeting the needs of all students while building relationships with the community, parents, and business partners to support all of Barton's initiatives.
Ramos, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	Focus on student academic achievement in all content areas in addition to closing the achievement gaps for all subgroups. Building teacher capacity in meeting the needs of all students.
De La Cruz, Karla	Assistant Principal	Focus on the goal to increase student academic achievement in all content areas in addition to closing the achievement gap for all students. Building teacher capacity in meeting the needs of all students while building relationships with the community, parents, and business partners to support all of Barton's initiatives.
Briggs, Christine	Other	ESOL Coordinator-Close the achievement gap and build teacher capacity in working with ELL students. Teacher professional development focuses on differentiation and scaffolds to reach all ELL students in addition to providing small group instruction to increase ELL students' capacity.
Weller, Meleshia	Instructional Coach	Build teacher capacity in literacy instruction through the coaching cycle and professional development in addition to working with students to close the achievement gap in literacy. She will work specifically with ELA teachers in grades 4-5.
Taylor, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Build teacher capacity in literacy instruction through the coaching cycle and professional development in addition to working with students to close the achievement gap in literacy. She will work specifically with ELA teachers in grades K-1.
Maggio, Tracy	Instructional Coach	Build teacher capacity in math instruction through the coaching cycle and professional development in addition to working with students to close the achievement gap in math.
Bolen, Alana	Teacher, ESE	Close the achievement gap and build teacher capacity in working with ESE students. Teacher professional development focuses on differentiation and scaffolds to reach all ESE students in addition to providing small group instruction to increase ESE students' capacity.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
allen, chelsea	Administrative Support	Single School Culture Coordinator-Focus on student academic achievement in all content areas in addition to closing the achievement gaps for all subgroups. Building teacher capacity in meeting the needs of all students.
Fullerton, Ivania	Instructional Coach	Build teacher capacity in literacy instruction through the coaching cycle and professional development in addition to working with students to close the achievement gap in literacy. She will work specifically with ELA teachers in grades 2-3.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Denise Sanon

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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

96

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* Native American Students* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students*

	White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	158	173	165	170	215	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1037
Attendance below 90 percent	0	47	57	42	71	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	274
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	5	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	93	109	112	133	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	541
Course failure in Math	0	54	62	77	89	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	355
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	37	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	27	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	164	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	288
FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	105	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197

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	69	71	74	116	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	417

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	3	40	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	190	170	177	236	158	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1079
Attendance below 90 percent	31	18	18	17	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	65	100	89	108	86	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	89	62	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227

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	15	15	13	90	68	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	259

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	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	190	170	177	236	158	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1079
Attendance below 90 percent	31	18	18	17	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	65	100	89	108	86	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	89	62	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227

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	15	15	13	90	68	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	259

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	41	37	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	33%	58%	57%	25%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	63%	58%	37%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	56%	53%	46%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	68%	63%	40%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	68%	62%	40%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	59%	51%	39%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	51%	53%	32%	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	22%	54%	-32%	58%	-36%
	2018	26%	56%	-30%	57%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	34%	62%	-28%	58%	-24%
	2018	29%	58%	-29%	56%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	32%	59%	-27%	56%	-24%
	2018	25%	59%	-34%	55%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	65%	-27%	62%	-24%
	2018	39%	63%	-24%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	67%	-24%	64%	-21%
	2018	45%	63%	-18%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	49%	65%	-16%	60%	-11%
	2018	33%	66%	-33%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	51%	-20%	53%	-22%
	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	7	36	54	21	51	56	12				
ELL	32	53	51	45	61	50	33				
AMI	27			41							
BLK	31	49	52	47	63	58	33				
HSP	36	50	52	51	61	52	39				
WHT	35	67		47	67						
FRL	33	51	54	48	62	53	36				
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	1	44	56	12	56	63	7				
ELL	23	51	50	42	62	60	18				
AMI	8	70		25	40						
BLK	31	55	69	42	63	67	47				
HSP	31	54	41	46	61	54	26				
WHT	19	50		53	70						
FRL	30	56	56	44	61	56	35				
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	3	22	44	15	38	39	31				
ELL	18	33	44	34	37	35	21				
BLK	22	37	38	38	40	44	33				
HSP	26	38	53	41	40	33	32				
WHT	33	38		38	46						
FRL	25	37	46	40	40	39	31				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	35
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	51
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	
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	54
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	50
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.

Based on state data, overall ELA data is 33% which is an increase of 3% from FY18 to FY19. However, our Diagnostic ELA data shows a decrease with 26% of students proficient with a Level 3,4, or 5 in grades 3-5. According to Diagnostics, third grade was predicted to be 22% proficient, fourth grade was 24% proficient, and fifth grade was 35%.

Contributing factors for these results might be due to the influx of students that we had after boundary changes. ELLs with less than 2 years in the country increased in 3rd (14%), 4th (22%), and 5th grade (18%). The influx of students also resulted in a shift of student population with 46% of incoming 4th-grade students were Level 1, and 57% of incoming 5th-grade students were Level 1. Due to the additional students we also had to hire 10 new teachers who needed additional support with differentiating instruction to meet the needs of our diverse populations.

ESSA data shows ESSA % points for both students with disabilities and Native American students is at 35%. According to FY20 Diagnostics, percent proficient on ELA decreased for SWD 13.1% in FY19 Diag to 10.6% in FY20 Diag but increased for math from 25.3% in FY19 Diag to 38.3% in FY20 Diag. However, the AIM student subgroup increased according to Diagnostic data-from 24% in ELA FY19 Diag to 24.% in ELA FY20 Diag and 41.7% in Math FY19 Diag to 59.5% in FY20 Diag.

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 previous year is a decrease in ELA learning gains. According to FSA, a decrease of 5%, 56% in 2018 to 51% in 2019. A contributing factor is the teacher's capacity to scaffold standards-based instruction to all students. As mentioned previously, there was also a decline in ELA performance when comparing FSA data to diagnostic data. Also, according to FY20 ELA Diagnostics, SWD students who were proficient was at 10.6% in FY20 (FY19 Diagnostics was at

13.1%) and American Indian was at 24.3%.in FY20 (FY19 Diagnostics was at 24%). Contributing factors include a lack of teacher capacity to meet student needs and be able to scaffold instruction.

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.

The data component that has the greatest gap when compared to the state average in ELA achievement. There is a difference of -24% (state-57%- school-33%). Contributing factors to the gap include teacher capacity in providing effective core instruction in ELA while scaffolding instruction to meet the needs of all subgroups.

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

Overall math achievement was the data component that showed the most improvement with an increase of +4% (44% in 2018 to 48% in 2019). Specifically, 5th-grade students showed an increase of 16% in math. Experienced teachers and effective collaboration and planning at PLCs contributed to this grade level's success. Also, diagnostic data shows that 46% of students were proficient in math with a level 3, 4, or 5. Based on diagnostic data, proficiency in 3rd grade was at 51%, 43% in 4th, and 43% in 5th grade. The increase can be attributed to targeted small group instruction and support from academic tutors focusing on student needs and weaknesses. PD offered during PLC, PD days and other times also focused on meeting students' needs. There was also an increase in subgroup data when comparing FY19 Diagnostic to FY20 Diagnostic. SWD increased to 38.3% in FY20 (25.3% IN FY19) and American Indians increased to 59.5% in FY20 (41.7% in FY19).The use of the manipulatives in math and the teacher's ability to scaffold and differentiate supported this increase as well.

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

Reflecting on the EWS, one area of concern is current active students with course failure in ELA (93 in 1st, 102 in 2nd, 112 in 3rd, 133 in 4th, and 94 in 5th), Another concern is the amount of Level 1s on FSA ELA (37 in 4th and 56 in 5th). EWS data shows that students in the primary grades are also struggling with ELA as proven by the number of active students with a failure in ELA (93-1st grade, 109-2nd grade, and 112-3rd grade). A focus on having students become proficient readers and master the standards in the primary grades is needed to support the tested grades.

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

1. Increase overall ELA proficiency, ELA learning gains, and third grade ELA proficiency. Data shows that ELA is the content area that is performing the lowest (33%) when compared to the state average (57%). Also, 3rd-grade proficiency was the lowest (22%) when compared to the other grade levels (4th-34% and 5th-32%). EWS data also shows that we have 37 fourth grade Level 1 student on 2019 FSA and 56 Level 1 fifth grade students in 2019 FSA. A focus on ELA in all grades K-5 is needed to increase student achievement in the tested grades.
2. Ensure learning gains and progress for ESSA categorized subgroups (SWD and AMI). State data shows that these students are underperforming when compared to other subgroups. While there has been a focus on our ELLs that make up 59% of the school and their ESSA percent is at 48%, a similar focus on meeting the needs of SWD and AMI is needed during PLC and Common Planning to ensure their needs are being met.
3. Increase in Math and science proficiency. While there is an upwards trend in both math and science in all subgroups, we still want to focus on these two content areas and increase our gains.
4. Strengthen core instruction while providing scaffolds to improve academic achievement for all students. If core instruction is effective in all grade levels, the need to remediate will be lower and students in all grade levels will be better prepared to achieve.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

To ensure progress towards student achievement in ELA, Math, and Science to align with the District's Strategic Plan; LTO #1; Increase reading proficiency and LTO #2; Ensure High School Readiness.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based on state data from FY19, overall ELA data is 33% which is an increase of 3% when compared to FY18. However, the state average was 57%. When looking at ELA performance by grade and comparing FY19 to FY18, third grade decreased (-4%), fourth grade increased (+5% same grade comparison and +8% cohort comparison), and fifth grade increased (+7% same grade comparison and +3% cohort comparison). Our learning gains in ELA decreased by 6% from 56% in 2/018 to 51% in 2019. Also, our ELA L25 percentile decreased by 2% from 56% in 2019 to 54% in 2019. Our greatest decline from the previous year is a decrease in ELA learning gains, a decreased of 5%; 56% in 2019 to 51% in 2019.

Math raw data shows an increase of 4% from 44% in 2018 to 48% in 2019 but the state average was at 68% in 2019 so there is a 20% gap. The math learning gains decreased by 1% from 61% in 2018 to 62% in 2019. Math L25 decreased 3% from 56% in 2018 to 53% in 2019.

Science state data shows an increase of 1% from 35% in 2018 to 36% in 2019 with the state average being 53%, a gap of 18%.

ESSA data shows SWD was 35% and Native American students were at 35%.

During midyear, our Diagnostic raw data shows that 26% of students were proficient in ELA with 3rd grade at 21%, 4th at 24%, and 5th at 35%. SWD students were only at 7.6% and Am Indians was 24% but math was 46% and science at 40%.

Measurable Outcome:

Our measurable goals for the FY21 school year will be to increase at least 10% in all content areas when comparing FY19 FSA results and FY21 FSA results.

ELA-43%

ELA Learning Gains-61%

ELA L25% Gains-64%

Math-58%

Math Learning Gains-72%

Math L25% Gains-63%

Science-46%

Due to the lack of data for FY20 because of state-mandated school closures (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue to work on our goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Sanon (denise.sanon@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Effective Core Instruction
2. Effective PLCs
3. Double Down Instruction
4. Tutorial

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Effective Core Instruction- If core instruction is effective, there will be a decrease in the need to reteach which will increase student proficiency.
2. Effective PLCs-Through collaboration and planning for standards-based instruction with a focus on scaffolding and differentiation, teachers will provide effective core instruction to students.
3. Double Down Instruction- Double down instruction will allow that all students receive strategic, small group instruction that is differentiated to meet their specific needs.

4. Tutorial-Students will receive additional learning opportunities to increase proficiency and growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Effective Core Instruction

- a. Plan for standards-based instruction through PLCs.
- b. Implementation of scaffolds to address all learners.
- c. Effective student grouping.
- d. Monitoring will occur through lesson plan reviews, classroom walk-throughs, virtual classroom visits, student data analysis, and data chats. (AP-Tara Johnson)

Person Responsible Tara Johnson (tara.johnson@palmbeachschools.org)

2. Effective PLCs

- a. Plan for aligning instruction to meet the rigor of the standards at PLCs.
- b. Plan for data-driven instruction and action planning at PLCs.
- c. Provide professional development to teachers in how to differentiate and scaffold instruction to meet the needs of all students.
- d. Monitoring will occur through lesson plan reviews, classroom walk-throughs, student data analysis, and data chats. (AP-Karla De La Cruz)

Person Responsible Karla De La Cruz (karla.delacruz@palmbeachschools.org)

3. Double Down Instruction

- a. Double down teacher will follow a schedule to ensure students receive additional small group instruction.
- b. Double down teacher will provide targeted standards-based instruction to students based on students' strengths/weaknesses.
- c. During the distance learning Double down teacher will pull groups virtually.
- c. Monitoring will occur through lesson plan reviews, classroom walk-throughs, google meet walk-throughs, student data analysis, and data chats. (SSCC-Chelsea Allen)

Person Responsible chelsea allen (chelsea.allen@palmbeachschools.org)

4. Tutorial

- a. Students needing remediation and enrichment will be identified to receive additional instruction outside of the school day.
- b. Students will receive standards-based instruction to meet their academic goals and increase academic achievement.
- c. Students will receive tutorial virtually during the specified times with a tutor in a small group.
- c. Monitoring will occur through attendance, google meet walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and student data analysis. (AP-Karla De La Cruz)

Person Responsible Karla De La Cruz (karla.delacruz@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 focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of the Holocaust

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

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

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols. We utilize a behavior matrix, teach expected behaviors, and monitor SwPBS. At Barton, we integrate Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success, through Family Nights, Curriculum Nights, SAC meetings, and announcements. Some of these meetings may be virtual this year due to COVID 19. The effectiveness of these efforts is monitored using SwPBS data from online data warehouses (EDW and Performance Matters). Data is monitored by the administration team and discussed at grade level meetings and PLCs if necessary. We recognize students who exhibit positive behaviors on campus by providing incentives throughout the year. A student of the month is also being recognized school-wide.

School academic goals are predominately displayed and discussed in PLCs, faculty meetings, and parent meetings. Parent meetings with support from APTT address the academic goals with students and families and provide families with strategies that they can implement at home to help the child succeed. Tutorial that begins usually begins in Winter is also offered before school, after school, and on Saturdays. Administration, teachers, and coaches also conduct data chats with teachers and students to support our academic goals. Enrichment clubs such as SECME and the Leadership Club provide additional academic opportunities for students and possible avenues to advance their career goals after high school.

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.

Barton Elementary builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders in alignment with the school's mission to support the needs of all students. Monthly SAC meetings are at a time that is conducive to parent participation. Parent University provides parents opportunities to learn about how to support student learning at home. APTT also provides parents and families with data-based action planning and strategies that they can use at home to support student learning. Parent University and other monthly parent events are planned to help parents understand how they can support student's education at home. This school year, due to social distancing, we will be facilitating most of these meetings virtually. Parents have access to laptops and the internet and will be able to participate virtually. Partnership with For the Children through 21st Century provides students with additional academic tutoring, enrichment, extracurricular activities, homework assistance, health and wellness opportunities, social and emotional learning, and family services. Other partnerships include Publix and Red Apple which provides teachers and students with needed supplies. A partnership with the Center for Creative Education also provides teachers the opportunity to provide standards-based instruction through a project-based learning approach.

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: Differentiation				\$1,170.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	0741 - Barton Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	1170.0	\$1,170.00
			Notes: Pending SAC approval.			
Total:						\$1,170.00