The School District of Palm Beach County

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| 3 |
|----|
| |
| 4 |
| |
| 7 |
| |
| 12 |
| |
| 18 |
| 24 |
| 24 |
| 24 |
| |

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary

16020 OKEECHOBEE BLVD, Loxahatchee, FL 33470

https://lges.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Richard Myerson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2004

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 88% |
| 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: A (64%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| 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 | or more information, <u>click here</u> . |

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 |
| <u> </u> | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary

16020 OKEECHOBEE BLVD, Loxahatchee, FL 33470

https://lges.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2019-20 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | School | No | 64% | |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 53% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | A | A | В | В |

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.

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School's mission is to engage and empower all of our students through a STEAM based educational platform supporting the attainment of their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School is to create a safe and supportive environment in which students will be able to excel academically, take ownership of their learning, and find the great enthusiasms that will fire their curiosity and passion for lifelong learning, discovery, and creativity. Our students will ASK critical questions, IMAGINE possibilities, PLAN collaboratively, CREATE innovative solutions, and IMPROVE continuously.

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 |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| Myerson, Richard | Principal | -Functions collaboratively with the School Advisory Council to assess school needs, develop a meaningful School Improvement Plan, and introduce those changes in school programs and personnel assignments that will result in the achievement of school performance objectives and other District goals. -Monitors the implementation of effective instruction to meet the needs of all students. -Eliminates barriers and distractions that interfere with effective teaching and learning. -Provides professional learning for teacher leaders to ensure they have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to fulfill their responsibilities as facilitators of learning among peers, have a deep understanding of content and standards, instructional credibility, and professional respect and trust. -Provides effective communications with and seeks input from parents, teachers, students and the community via systematic processes. |
| Joy, Amy | Teacher, K-12 | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Levitt, Sharyn | Teacher, K-12 | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Rubenstien, Ashley | Teacher, K-12 | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Manuel, Marco | Teacher, K-12 | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Quinn, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Bradley, Juliana | Assistant Principal | -Deepens understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college- and career-readiness. -Serves as the cheerleader, coach, and standard bearer for the vision. -Supports professional learning and collaboration amongst teachers and resource staff and facilitates and leads professional learning focused on content, instruction, and pedagogical content knowledge. -Supports the principal in building a culture of pride, trust, and respect. - Carries out the principal's expectations for staff for engaging with teacher leaders in ongoing efforts to improve instruction and student learning. -Utilize the expertise of teachers who have solved persistent instructional problems and supports the sharing of these practices and ongoing inquiry among staff. |
| D'angelo, Renee | Teacher, PreK | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|------------------|---|
| Maldonado, Barbara | Teacher, K-12 | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Ramirez, Christine | Teacher, K-12 | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Knisley, Marianne | Other | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Mayorga, Maria | Teacher, ESE | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Katz, Martha | Teacher, PreK | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |
| Carroll, Debra | Teacher, PreK | Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to the team, and monitor areas of responsibility. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/10/2004, Richard Myerson

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.

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Demographic Data

| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|--|---------------------------|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |

| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
|---|---|
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 88% |
| 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 |
| | 2018-19: A (64%) |
| | 2017-18: B (58%) |
| School Grades History | 2016-17: B (58%) |
| | 2015-16: B (57%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf | formation* |
| 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 | e. 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 |
|---|----|-------------|----|----|-----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 63 | 71 | 70 | 73 | 105 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 457 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 13 | 13 | 20 | 18 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 23 | 21 | 34 | 14 | 6 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| Course failure in Math | 4 | 5 | 21 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| FY20 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| FY20 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | G | rade | e Lo | eve | el | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|----|----|----|---|------|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 7 | 11 | 26 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantan | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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

Thursday 8/20/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Number of students enrolled | 68 | 69 | 75 | 98 | 76 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 476 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 6 | 15 | 13 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 18 | 24 | 34 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | | 4 | 13 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| In diastan | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | vel | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 68 | 69 | 75 | 98 | 76 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 476 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 6 | 15 | 13 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 18 | 24 | 34 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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).

| Sahaal Grada Campanant | | 2019 | | 2018 | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | | |
| ELA Achievement | 61% | 58% | 57% | 52% | 53% | 55% | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 57% | 63% | 58% | 57% | 59% | 57% | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 59% | 56% | 53% | 62% | 55% | 52% | | |
| Math Achievement | 79% | 68% | 63% | 67% | 62% | 61% | | |
| Math Learning Gains | 72% | 68% | 62% | 61% | 62% | 61% | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | 59% | 51% | 49% | 53% | 51% | | |
| Science Achievement | 52% | 51% | 53% | 61% | 51% | 51% | | |

| | EWS Indi | cators as | Input Ea | rlier in th | e Survey | | |
|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|-------------|----------|-----|-------|
| Indicator | | Grade | Level (pri | or year re | ported) | | Total |
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | TOTAL |
| | (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 | 65% | 54% | 11% | 58% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 56% | 1% | 57% | 0% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 52% | 62% | -10% | 58% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 58% | -4% | 56% | -2% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 63% | 59% | 4% | 56% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 59% | 1% | 55% | 5% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 3% | | | • | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 9% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 78% | 65% | 13% | 62% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 63% | 9% | 62% | 10% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 73% | 67% | 6% | 64% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 63% | -2% | 62% | -1% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 75% | 65% | 10% | 60% | 15% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 66% | 6% | 61% | 11% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 14% | | | | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 53% | 51% | 2% | 53% | 0% | | | | | | | | |

| | | | SCIENCE | | | |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 56% | 56% | 0% | 55% | 1% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 25 | 42 | 52 | 44 | 70 | 68 | 14 | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 52 | 56 | 67 | 79 | 60 | 21 | | | | |
| BLK | 65 | | | 82 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 60 | 67 | 74 | 75 | 60 | 33 | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 51 | 41 | 82 | 67 | 71 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 56 | 59 | 73 | 72 | 61 | 44 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 24 | 39 | 47 | 41 | 57 | 42 | 50 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 48 | 45 | 59 | 59 | 60 | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 62 | | 56 | 31 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 57 | 47 | 68 | 58 | 42 | 55 | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 65 | 44 | 77 | 58 | 50 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 60 | 44 | 66 | 54 | 47 | 52 | | | | |
| | | 2017 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 24 | 41 | 54 | 41 | 58 | 46 | 44 | | | | |
| ELL | 17 | 56 | 73 | 50 | 50 | 55 | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 75 | | 65 | 65 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 45 | 53 | 58 | 60 | 47 | 38 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 58 | 60 | 71 | 60 | 31 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 55 | 67 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 55 | | | | |

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 | 63 |

| ESSA Federal Index | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO | | | |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | | | | |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | | | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 502 | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | | | | |
| Percent Tested | 99% | | | |
| Subgroup Data | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | | | | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 43 | | | |
| 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 | 53 | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| Native American Students Federal Index - Native American Students | | | | |
| | N/A | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | N/A 0 | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Asian Students | | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students | 0 | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | 0 N/A | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 N/A | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students | 0 N/A 0 | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 0 N/A 0 | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | 0 N/A 0 74 NO | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 N/A 0 74 NO | | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students | 0 N/A 0 74 NO 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 | 64 | | | |
| Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | 64 NO | | | |
| | - | | | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | | | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | NO | | | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% Economically Disadvantaged Students | NO 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.

FY19 FSA ESOL student proficiency was 6%. ESOL students on Fy20 ELA Diagnostics increased in proficiency to 19%. However, ESOL proficiency in ELA is still the lowest performance out of the other subgroups.

The ESOL students are still learning to read and write in English and it can be a struggle until they have been in the county for a few years. The contributing factor was the high mobility of students within this subgroup making attaining a strong reading foundation a challenge. In addition, these students lack the foundational reading and writing skills in the English language. Historically this subgroup has the lowest performance in achievement.

During FY20 we strategically focused on supporting this ESSA group, we ensured that students had opportunities for two differentiated small group rotations daily. Our Centril Region ESOL Specialist came to work with our ESOL teacher weekly on lesson design and implementation and also work with our K-5 teachers to support their ESOL students.

Due to a lack of data for FY20 because of state mandated school closure (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue one of our FY20 ELA goals for FY21.

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

4th grade proficiency on the FY19 FSA Math in 4th grade was 76%. Those same students the following year scored 66% proficient on the FY20 Math Diagnostic in 5th grade, which is a 10% decline. The drop in 5th grade can be attributed to a brand new teacher in 5th grade teaching math.. She worked alongside a veteran math teacher on her team to develop standards-based instruction. Both teachers followed the District's scope and sequence to ensure all standards would be appropriately taught. However, both teachers were utilizing a new math textbook and online platform and supplementing matierals to meet the needs of their students.

For FY21, we plan to ensure that in PLCs ample time is dedicated to understanding and unpacking the math standards and also include frequent formative assessments to monitor student understanding.

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.

FY19 FSA ESOL student proficiency of 6% had the greatest gap between the school-wide ELA proficiency at 61% and the state proficiency at 55%. The ESOL students are still learning to read and write in English and it can be a struggle until they have been in the county for a few years.

FY20 midyear data comparison of FY19 FSA to FY20 winter Diagnostics:

ESOL student proficiency on the FY20 ELA Winter Diagnostic increased to 19% from 6% on the FY19 ELA FSA.

Some of the contributing factors of the increase in performance is the emphasis on supporting the ESOL students through differentiated small group rotations daily. Our Central Region ESOL Specialist came to work with our ESOL teacher weekly on lesson design and implementation and also work with our K-5 teachers to support their ESOL students.

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

The ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 all improved by a total of 10% from FY19 ELA FSA to FY20 ELA Winter Diagnostic. This can be attributed to a focus on teaching the standards during core instruction, targeted small groups, frequent monitoring of student understanding, and collaborative PLCs. Teachers adhered to a defined literacy framework. Administration conducted literacy walkthroughs to ensure implementation of 90 block components, standards-alignment, and ongoing data chats.

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

Attendance continues to be an area of concern for our school.

For FY20, we implemented a perfect attendance program where students earn a party at the end of the month if they attended school every day that month.

The Assistant Principal and Attendance Clerk monitored attendance daily and parents were notified each day by phone thath their child was absent. The Assistant Principal followed the District's attendance guidelines, scheduled parent conferences, School-Based Team meetings for Truancy and conducted home visits when necessary.

With 11% of our student population with attendance below 90%, we will continue to make that an area of focus.

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

1. Increase ELA Achievement and Reading Gains, with an emphasis on students in the Low 25 and ESOL students by use of balanced literacy, and guided reading using Fountas and Pinnell strategies

and materials during the small group instruction rotational model.

- 2. Science scores in 5th grade still lag behind the rest of the tested subjects. Increase Science Proficiency by focusing on science vocab, visual notebooks, and a hands-on science lab one day per week. This includes integration of grade level Reading within content areas including science and social studies additional passages in using the same reading strategies.
- 3. 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.
- 4. Increase Teacher Capacity/provide Professional Development During PLCs and after school: we will focus on developing effective and relevant instruction through: unpacking standards, analyzing data, developing standards based lesson using vetted resources and materials from the District, share best practices, following/participating with the coaching continuum model, incorporate research based strategies included but not limited to guided reading, vocabulary instruction, interactive shared reading, and Go-To Strategies.
- 5. Continue to monitor student attendance and follow District's attendance procedures as well as incentivize student attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

To ensure effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students, teachers will differentiate instruction, especially for ELL students through small group instruction. The teachers will be able to identify and teach to the individual student needs.

Historically, our ELL population has the lowest performance in achievement in ELA. Each year, LGES has an increasing enrollment of beginning and emerging speakers according to the ELDC. Only 6% of the ELL students scored level 3 or higher on the FY19 ELA FSA and

19% level 3 or higher on the FY20 ELA Diagnostics.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 2021, 25% of the ELL students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher on the FY21 ELA FSA. This is an increase from FY20 diagnostic of 19% level 3 or higher. During the end of the year, our students were taught through virtual 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 goals for FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Tetreault (jennifer.tetreault@palmbeachschools.org.org)

1. Students will receive daily explicit vocabulary instruction K-5 throughout the content areas.

Evidencebased Strategy:

- 2. Teachers will expose students to grade level text through shared reading, choral reading, and reading aloud.
- 3. Teachers will utilize and teach students to use a common language for close reading strategies.
- 4. Students will participate in small group instruction with a focus on grade level standards, oral language, and reading behaviors.
- 1. Use of Explicit Vocabulary Instruction will increase students' oral language and comprehension.

Rationale for

Evidence-

2. Students will become more fluent readers, which in turn, will increase their comprehension.

based Strategy:

- 3. Using common language for close reading strategies will increase their comprehension with increased automaticity.
- 4. Differentiated small groups will impact their fluency and comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Continue ongoing training of all teachers and CLFs on ESOL Go-To-Strategies and best practices.
- a. Teachers have the option of attending virtual ESOL training as part of their inservice compliance.
- b. Teachers will utilize the ESOL Go-To-Strategies when planning their lessons and share best practices in PLCs.

Person

Responsible

Jennifer Tetreault (jennifer.tetreault@palmbeachschools.org.org)

- 2. One-on-one coaching to individual staff members by the Area ESOL Specialist.
- a. The Area ESOL Specialist will be able to observe virtual instruction and meet virtually with teachers to discuss feedback and areas of improvement.
- b. The Area ESOL Specialist will work with the ESOL teacher to design and implement effective lessons.
- c. PLC time will be used to collaborate between ESOL teacher and ELA teacher on differentiated planning.

Person Responsible

Juliana Bradley (juliana.bradley@palmbeachschools.org)

- 3. Data driven small group lessons will occur to focus on student needs.
- a. Teachers will participate in frequent data chats to discuss ELL performance on school and district assessments.
- b. Teachers will utilize data to plan for instruction and monitor students' understanding and mastery of concepts.

Person

Juliana Bradley (juliana.bradley@palmbeachschools.org)

Responsible

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

To ensure progress towards student achievement in Science and to align with the District's Strategic Plan; LTO #2; Ensure High School Readiness.

The 5th grade Science FSA assesses student mastery of Fair Game Benchmarks that are covered in K-4, but not in 5th grade. In addition to being assessed on the science benchmarks, students also need to be able to read and comprehend the questions, answers, as well as diagrams, and other graphics. Science proficiency dropped from 57%

to 52% which is one point lower than the State proficiency of 53%.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 2021, 60% of students in 5th grade will score a level 3 or higher on the FY20 SSA. During the end of the year, our students were taught through virtual 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 goals for FY21.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

Richard Myerson (richard.myerson@palmbeachschools.org)

1. Teachers will focus on the integrated progression of Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic vocabulary from grades K through 5.

Evidencebased Strategy:

2. Teachers will facilitate the integration of science content through the ELA nonfiction curriculum grades K-5.

3. Teachers will normalize the utilization of concept mapping/ graphic organizer K-5.

4. Teachers will develop and integrate test taking strategies utilizing school-wide common language and procedures for grades K-5.

Rationale for

1. To help students understand science concepts utilizing grade level appropriate language.

Evidencebased

Strategy:

2. To build background knowledge to support the conceptual understanding of science.

3. To help students understand science concepts and key terms in depth.

4. To help promote students' engagement in science texts by using close reading strategies and selection of appropriate evidence.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Share best practices and collaborate during PLCs.
- a. Monitoring of implementation will occur through observations, fidelity walks, and analysis of lesson plans.
- b. Participate in vertical PLCs to develop key terminology/ vocabulary by grade.
- c. Develop and utilize grade level concept maps/graphic organizers in PLCs.
- d. Administration will attend PLCs to support collaboration and provide guidance.

Person Responsible

Richard Myerson (richard.myerson@palmbeachschools.org)

- 2. Hands on activites, STEAM integration, and labs will be conducted as relevent to the needs of the lesson.
- a. Adminstration will conduct fidelity walks.
- b.
- C.

Person Responsible

Richard Myerson (richard.myerson@palmbeachschools.org)

- 3. Develop school-wide test-taking strategies and protocols.
- a. Teachers will provide formative and summative assessments to students.
- b. Hands on assessments including labs and experiments will be provided.

Person Responsible

Richard Myerson (richard.myerson@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 the History of the Holocaust, History of African Americans, study of the contributions of Hispanics and Women to the United States, and the Sacrifices of Veterans in the value of medal of honor recipients.

Addressing the Areas of Focus will contribute to the continuous monitoring of proven successful actions and processes as well as the development of new actions and processes to benefit student achievement. These deliberately designed action steps and processes are research-based with a history of success. They share a common theme of impacting student achievement, and the predicted outcomes would not be exclusive to only the Areas of Focus. It is anticipated ELA Achievement of ELL students will demonstrate positive data gains as a result of the action steps developed for both Areas of Focus.

Students are continuously engaged in rigorous standards-based activities that highlight multicultural diversity within the arts. Throughout the school year, students participate in art music and art programs of different cultures, countries, and eras. Students have access to books about cultures and contributions of Black and African Americans, Latino and Hispanics, and women in US History. Fifth grade studies the Holocaust and patrols visit the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC. (School Board Policy 2.09 and Florida State 1003.42) This access to ongoing multicultural studies enriches our students' educational experience and demonstrates our commitment to connect meaningfully with all facets of our school community.

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School integrates and continuously develops a Single School Culture by sharing our universal guidelines for success, teaching expected behaviors, communicating with parents, and monitoring PBS. Best practices for inclusive education are addressed through our anti-bullying campaign, mentoring and implementation of PBS programs. These actions influence student achievement and create an environment conducive to learning. Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School implements a School-Wide Positive Behavior Program by recognizing students exhibiting positive behaviors on campus. A student will be recognized every week for demonstrating efforts in their education. In addition, one student per class will be recognized monthly for demonstrating outstanding character in class and amongst peers. In addition, we utilize a behavior matrix, and teach expected behaviors, communicate with parents, and monitor SwPBS.

A migrant liaison provides services, and support for students and their parents. The liaison ensures that qualifying students' needs are met. Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and ELL students.

Violence Prevention Programs: Safe and Drug Free Schools - District receives funds for Red Ribbon Week and programs that support the prevention of violence in and around the school. These programs help to prevent the use of alcohol, tobacco, drugs, and foster a safe, drug free learning environment supporting student achievement and promoting an appreciation of multicultural diversity through planned activities.

Single School Culture (SSC) for Academics: Teachers attend weekly learning teams and common planning meetings where teachers collaborate on student work and assessments are analyzed to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses to drive instruction.

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.

The teachers, staff, and students embrace the universal guidelines developed and put in place. They adhere to the school-wide expectation/motto to Be Respectful, Responsible, and Safe all day. Students recognize that they have multiple opportunities throughout their day, week, month, trimester, and year to be recognized for doing their best.

The SwPBS committee of teachers, staff, and parents come together each month to share feedback and ideas from stakeholders as well as bring information from the meeting to their team members. Everything the committee does is a shared team decision that aligns with our belief system. Following our meetings, the agenda, minutes, and discipline dashboards are shared with the entire faculty, which then drives the discussion for future meetings. As a result of our efforts, Loxahatchee Groves Elementary earned the status of Positive Behavior Support Gold Model School for Fy 20.

Also, Loxahatchee Groves Elementary is a 5 Star School which recognizes schools that utilize and involve community stakeholders, business partners, and volunteers to support student achievement efforts.

In FY20, we developed a Care Team, comprised of our School Guidance Counselor, and Behavioral Health Professional (BHP), and Co-Located Mental Health Therapist and Assistant Princpal. This team meets weekly to discuss any student referral cases that teacher have brought to the team's attention. The Guidance Counselor is on the fine arts wheel and works as our core instructor of SEL, behavioral and mental health. Our BHP works with small groups of students on different areas including family issues, mindfulness, anxitey, social skills, etc. Then our Co-Located Therapist works 1:1 as a licences therapist to meet those student needs. This tiered approach has allowed the students to expand their social-emotional well-being.

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: Instructiona | \$610.00 | | | |
|---|----------|------------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----|---------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |

Palm Beach - 1901 - Loxahatchee Groves Elementary - 2020-21 SIP

| | | | 1901 - Loxahatchee Groves Elementary | School Improvement Funds | | \$610.00 |
|--|--|--------|---|--------------------------------|--------|------------|
| Notes: Daily sub to provide small group instruction to our ELL students. | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2 III.A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | | \$2,210.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 1901 - Loxahatchee Groves Elementary | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,210.00 |
| Notes: After school science tutorial for 5th grade students. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$2,820.00 |