

The School District of Palm Beach County

Lantana 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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Lantana Elementary School

710 W OCEAN AVE, Lantana, FL 33462

<https://lane.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Janyn Robinson

Start Date for this Principal: 2/2/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	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: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Lantana Elementary School

710 W OCEAN AVE, Lantana, FL 33462

<https://lane.palmbeachschools.org>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>92%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>85%</p>

School Grades History

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

The parents, staff and community of our school will provide a safe, nurturing, and equitable education that meets the social, academic and physical needs of each student so that all students will be successful learners and productive citizens who are college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lantana Elementary School envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Robinson, Janyyn	Principal	Maintain focus on academic focus and vision, coaching, feedback, data analysis, monitoring
Gordon, Elise	Instructional Coach	Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring. Focuses on math instruction. Also provides math PD or connects teachers to math PD.
Campbell, Elaina	Other	Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring. Focuses on ELA. Also, monitors the SEL integration across content areas.
Ordonez, Lesly	Teacher, K-12	Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring.
Rainey-Reese, Ranada	Teacher, K-12	Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring. Focuses on ELLs & how instruction to this subgroup can be improved to meet our overall SIP goals.
Camel, Pamela	Assistant Principal	Classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, monitoring.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 2/2/2015, Janyyn Robinson

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.*

4

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.*

9

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	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: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (41%)
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	70	63	87	74	65	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436
Attendance below 90 percent	0	29	28	29	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	36	33	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
FY20 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	35	28	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	32	35	31	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Wednesday 9/2/2020

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	55	74	67	59	63	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	29	23	10	14	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	2	3	0	15	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	55	47	38	55	61	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	298
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	38	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	25	19	8	38	41	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	55	74	67	59	63	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	29	23	10	14	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	2	3	0	15	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	55	47	38	55	61	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	298
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	38	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	25	19	8	38	41	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	41%	58%	57%	36%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	63%	58%	58%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	56%	53%	50%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	68%	63%	42%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	68%	62%	58%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	59%	51%	36%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	51%	53%	42%	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	44%	54%	-10%	58%	-14%
	2018	19%	56%	-37%	57%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	26%	62%	-36%	58%	-32%
	2018	35%	58%	-23%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	50%	59%	-9%	56%	-6%
	2018	35%	59%	-24%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	65%	-10%	62%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	33%	63%	-30%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	67%	-20%	64%	-17%
	2018	59%	63%	-4%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	75%	65%	10%	60%	15%
	2018	48%	66%	-18%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	51%	-10%	53%	-12%
	2018	31%	56%	-25%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	25	38	50	42	60	52	32				
ELL	35	54	50	57	69	53	37				
BLK	40	55	56	64	65	40	53				
HSP	31	44	50	48	63	58	25				
WHT	59	63		79	89		38				
FRL	39	51	53	60	66	51	39				

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	29	36	34	63	71	29				
ELL	19	47	56	39	70	61	11				
BLK	33	48	40	54	72	65	36				
HSP	22	35	58	30	64	67	14				
WHT	42	43		64	75		67				
FRL	30	42	44	47	69	66	33				

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	24	51	41	22	49	43	29				
ELL	26	59	58	35	45	30	26				
BLK	28	58	52	42	64	45	36				
HSP	33	51	46	32	43	27	30				
WHT	57	77		51	69		69				
FRL	34	58	51	41	57	36	39				

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	52
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	51
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	54
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	46
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	66
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

When looking at our school data from FY19, we experienced the lowest performance in the area of ELA Achievement. Our students achievement rate was 41%. This percentage was lower than all other content areas. Also, this achievement percentage was 16% lower than the State and 17% lower than the District.

One contributing factor shifting our PD focus to core instruction, specifically Read Aloud for grades 2 through 5. Our FY18 data for ELA was 31%, so we analyzed instruction throughout the 90 minute block as well as the Extended Reading time to determine weaknesses in instruction. We realized that we needed to provide additional PD on Read Alouds and also spend more time planning for effective, standards-based Read Alouds.

As a result, our ELA achievement data increased 10% from FY18 to FY19, however, it is still the lowest performance data we had in FY19. Furthermore, we experienced a 5% decrease on our ELA Achievement, according to our mid-year data. This was measured by the Winter Diagnostics. Our Achievement percentage was 36%. Also, our achievement data for ESE students is the lowest sub group.

We will continue to focus on core instruction, namely Read Aloud. 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. Also our FY20 mid year data supports the need to continue with our FY20 goals.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year came from Mathematics. Specifically, the math learning gains and the lowest 25%. We experienced a 4% decrease in both of these cells. In FY20, we had mid-year data from the Diagnostics. Studying cohorts, we determined that one grade level increased 23% when comparing their math achievement level on the previous year's FSA. Even though this 5th grade group had a large increase, the same was not true for the fourth graders. They decreased 6% on the mid-year data. This mid year data was also supported by progress on FSQs and USAs. This formative data consistently indicated that less than 50% of the students were demonstrating growth.

One contributing factor was not being strategic enough with small group instruction. Although L25 students were identified we didn't provide them with the frequency of small group instruction that they required. Moving forward, teachers will schedule weekly small groups, to ensure that our L25 receive the frequency of small group instruction that they require in order to make learning gains.

In order to address this factor, we will move forward with scheduling small groups in math. It is a practice that we do more with our reading blocks. Now, we will transfer this to math. Teachers will first identify the L25 students and also 'bubble students.' Next, teachers will create a small group schedule so those students needing it the most are provided small group instruction the most.

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.

Our ELA achievement data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state's ELA achievement was 57%. Our school's ELA achievement was 41%. There was less of a gap with the ELA learning gains and lowest 25% data components, when comparing our school to the state.

In addition to the FSA data, our ELA achievement data also experienced a decrease on our mid-year data. According to the Winter Diagnostics, our 3rd-5th graders reached only 33% achievement, this was 6% lower than the previous year's FSA data. Even though the Winter Diagnostics indicated 33% achievement, we frequently reviewed FY19 formative data during PLCs. FSQs and USAs were used to target skills and standards needing remediation and/or enrichment. Our analysis also indicated that 3rd-5th grade achievement was greater than 33%. On average, achievement ranged between 35-45%. Of course it's hard to compare this achievement level to Winter Diagnostics since the FSQs and USAs target specific standards and don't represent all standards like the Diagnostics.

The main contributing factor is that we had a large decrease in FY18. One cohort group in particular had a low ELA achievement percentage. We worked strategically to strengthen core instruction while also providing quality small group instruction in FY19. As a result, we increased ELA achievement by 10% and also increase learning gains and lowest 25% data. These results affirmed our efforts and also indicate that we need to continue on this path.

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

Our school demonstrated the most improvement with ELA and Math achievement. ELA achievement increased 10% and Math achievement increased 12%. When analyzing mid-year data, we didn't see the same increases in achievement, however cohort groups increased achievement level. This made us conclude that we needed to continue to hone in on core instruction.

Our school focused on core (standards-based) instruction. We also monitored the scope and sequence more, making sure teachers maintained an appropriate pace. Monitoring the scope and sequence was essential to growth, especially when it came to formative assessments. Since teachers in grades 3-5 followed the pacing of the scope and sequence, students were better prepared for the FSQ and USA testing windows. This was especially evident with 5th grade Math. 50% or more of the students consistently met achievement levels on the 5th grade FSQs and USAs.

ELA's core instruction focused on Read Alouds. We used our SSCC, District Reading Specialist, and Staff Developers from Teachers College to strengthen Read Alouds. Specifically, teachers engaged in cycles of PD, where they received content/modeling, then immediately implemented learning with their students, then they received coaching and feedback. Finally, we started the cycle over again, adjusting the content/modeling based on the trends across grade levels and/or specific needs of the teachers. For Math, we made sure teachers were not spending a lot of time re-teaching previous grade level material. We utilized iReady, Reflex Math, and small group instruction for re-teaching and remediation.

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

1. One area of concern is attendance rates. We need to decrease the number of absences, especially in grades K through 2. Students must attend school daily, in order to learn. Also, we need to help our families understand the rigor and depth of the K-2 standards. They need to recognize that daily attendance is imperative for all grade levels, not just the FSA tested grade levels. Also, as mentioned above, we need to focus on ELA achievement, especially the ESE subgroup as evidenced by FY19 FSA data as well as FY20 Winter Diagnostic data.

Working with the Wallace Foundation and providing students with explicit Social Emotional Learning

(SEL) is how we will decrease the number of absences. Teachers will start the day with Morning Meeting which is highly engaging and students want to arrive to school and participate.

Since we are part of a grant funded initiative, we receive data from RAND. Our beginning of the year FY19 data indicated that 80% of our teachers reported that they utilize Morning Meeting and the 2nd Step explicit SEL curriculum throughout the week.

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

Our number one priority in the upcoming school year is to plan and teach high quality, standards-based Read Alouds. This will allow us to increase our ELA achievement levels. It will also address some of the deficits we see with our ESE subgroup data. This priority will also support the District's Strategic Plan, specifically the Long Term Outcome that strives to increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade. We will continue to implement coaching cycles in order to build capacity with planning and teaching high quality, standards-based Read Alouds. First, teachers will receive PD, next they will be expected to implement their learning with their students. Admin and the Leadership Team will monitor implementation. After at least two weeks of implementation, teachers will be coached and provided feedback. This coaching may come from Admin, SSCC, Staff Developers from Teachers College, and/or our District Literacy Specialist. Admin is also debriefed on the day of coaching & feedback, either at the end of that day or at our Leadership Team Meeting. At the debrief, we determine trends (grade level/teacher), and then start the cycle again. The next time the cycle begins, we can address the trends observed (common, reoccurring next steps).

Next, we will provide small group math instruction. This is a priority because we need to ensure equity so all students receive the quality and frequency of instruction that they need. By providing small group math instruction, we will address our Lowest 25% data. Also, many of our ESE subgroup fall into the Lowest 25%. This priority not only supports our overall school performance and our ESE subgroup, but it also supports the District's second Long Term Outcome which is to ensure high school readiness. We will utilize Math PLCs for supporting teachers with small group instruction. Math PLCs provide an opportunity for teachers to analyze common formative data. Teachers can also review SuccessMaker and Reflex Math (grades 2nd-5th) data. After reviewing data and considering the scope and sequence, teachers can determine which skills need remediation. In addition to identifying skills, it is essential for teachers to 'map out' who will be in their small groups and the frequency those groups will be taught. Support for this process will be available during PLC since Admin and the Math Resource Teacher all attend the Math PLCs. Furthermore, the ESE teachers attend PLC, so they can assist with strategies that would best meet the needs of our ESE students, especially since we are targeting the ESE subgroup.

Another priority for schoolwide improvement is to implement Morning Meeting daily. We feel this will increase attendance rates. When reviewing the Early Warning data, it is evident that we need to improve attendance rates. Morning Meetings are an impactful way to build classroom community as well as teach Social Emotional Learning. Research shows that this increases attendance rates and can also positively impact academics. All homeroom teachers will facilitate a Morning Meeting with their class. Some teachers are not able to start the day off with Morning Meeting, due to the Master Schedule. For example, the second grade team cannot start Morning Meeting at 8am because their day begins with a 30 minute supplemental reading block. Therefore, their Morning Meeting is within the first hour of the day.

Embedded in Morning Meeting is explicit SEL instruction. This is delivered by the teacher, using 2nd Step Curriculum. Kindergarten through second grade teachers are expected to teach a 2nd Step lesson at least three times a week. Lessons teach one of the five Casel SEL competencies (self-management, self-awareness, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision

making). Teachers in grades three through five, are expected to teach the 2nd Step Curriculum at least once per week. These grade levels are different because of challenges with departmentalized schedules as well as the demands of FSA testing on the intermediate grades and their schedule. Morning Meetings and 2nd Step Curriculum is monitored by Administration and the SEL Lead Teacher. Also, we have built in supports for Morning Meetings, 2nd Step Curriculum, and SEL in general. Teachers can get support from the SEL Lead Teacher, SEL Champion, and/or the District SEL Specialist assigned to our school. Another support comes from the SEL Team. This team meets monthly to discuss SEL needs and initiatives. The team consists of teachers from the various grade levels on campus.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

To ensure progress towards students achievement in ELA and Math, 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:

Research indicates that the biggest impact to student achievement is teacher effectiveness. This is why it is imperative to focus on instructional practice. We felt that this instructional practice needed to be specifically related to standards-aligned instruction because teachers need to facilitate instruction that addresses the full intent of the grade level standards. When teachers plan and deliver strong standards-based instruction, the impact on student learning will be positive.

This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need based on the data components. ELA achievement has the greatest gap when compared to the state (41% to 57%). Also, ELA achievement is 34% lower than our Districts FY21 LTO # 1 goal of 75%. In addition to ELA, our Math learning gains data decreased 4% for both regular learning gains as well as the learning gains for the lowest 25%.

Due to the lack of data for FY20 because of state mandated school closure (Covid 19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue with our FY20 goals for FY21. We also made this determination based on our analysis of the FY20 mid year data. This data was referenced in our Needs Assessment/Analysis.

Measurable Outcome:

By June of 2021 we will increase ELA achievement by 5 percent (ELA achievement = 46%) and increase Math learning gains by 5%. This will mean Math Learning Gains will be 71% and Learning Gains for the lowest 25% will be 55%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janyn Robinson (janyn.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Establish Professional Learning Communities cycles that focus on unpacking standards and planning for standards-aligned instruction.
2. Implement coaching cycles that focus on standards-based Read Alouds.
3. Differentiated small group instruction will be utilized in ELA and Math. Instruction will still be standards-based, while meeting the individual needs of the students in the groups.
4. Students will engage in adaptive technology to offer personalized instruction that is standards-based. The technology will provide support, reteaching, and enrichment at their level (iReady, Reflex Math, SuccessMaker)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. PLCs offer an opportunity for teachers to plan instruction with the guidance of instructional leaders (Admin, resource teachers, ESOL Coordinator, SSCC). PLCs also provide time and guidance with data analysis, while also building in systems for accountability.
2. Coaching cycles provide an intentional strategy for building teacher capacity. The cycle allows for teachers to learn and plan, implement through teaching, provide feedback, and then start the cycle again. As teachers continue to cycle through this strategy for coaching, they will experience shifts in their teaching.
3. Small group instruction provides an opportunity for students to receive enrichment and remediation on a variety of ELA and Math skills. The ability to personalize instruction to meet individual needs will result in increased achievement and scores.
4. iReady and SuccessMaker will offer the opportunity for students to receive enrichment and remediation on a variety of skills.

Action Steps to Implement

PLCs (Leadership Team)

1. Establish a PLC calendar
2. Establish a way of work for PLCs (Welcoming Ritual, Data Analysis, Planning, Commitments, Optimistic Closure)
3. Grade level/content teachers will collaborate to plan for standards-based instruction
4. Administration, resource teachers, ESOL Coordinator, and SSCC will attend and help with PLC facilitation
5. Teachers will take ownership of PLCs by deciding the data to be analyzed and the specific component for standards-based lesson planning

Person Responsible Janyn Robinson (janyn.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

Coaching Cycles (Leadership Team)

1. Use PLC or Teachers College Staff Developer days to decide on the focus
2. Teachers receive new learning or review strategies
3. Teachers are guided through planning for the particular focus
4. Coach models the planning and strategy (lesson)
5. Teachers sign up for a time for individual coaching (within 3 weeks of the initial training/PD/PLC)
6. Coach visits each teacher and provides individual feedback
7. Admin and Coach discuss grade level/content trends and share during PLCs
8. Admin & Coach establish another date (within 3 weeks) for follow up with individual teachers

Person Responsible Janyn Robinson (janyn.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

Small Group Instruction (Leadership Team)

1. Use PLCs to identify student groupings. Pay particular attention to students in the lowest 25%
2. Use PLCs to plan instruction for small groups, utilizing unpacked standards and grade level scope & sequence
3. Teachers identified times in their content block for small group instruction
4. Leadership Team monitor small group instruction and share out trends and next steps during PLCs

Person Responsible Janyn Robinson (janyn.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

iReady & SuccessMaker (Leadership Team)

1. Make sure all teachers have the necessary training for both platforms
2. Make sure SIS scheduling is correct, so that all students are on the correct roster & the appropriate teachers can access individual student data
3. Teachers determine specific times in their daily schedule for iReady and SuccessMaker
4. Utilize PLCs for data analysis, problem solving, and planning based on data from iReady & SuccessMaker
5. Monitor usage and performance and discuss trends and next steps during PLCs

Person Responsible Janyn Robinson (janyn.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 second Strategic Theme (Positive & Supportive School Climate), we have a goal of decreasing the number of students with an attendance rate of less than 90%. Currently, 25% of the students fell into this category. The previous year, it was 26%. Our goal is to decrease this percentage by 5%.

We plan to be strategic as we address the attendance concern at Lantana Elementary. Here are the actions we will take for improvement:

- 1. provide Morning Meeting (SEL)- this builds community, is engaging, starts the day off in a positive way, and encourages students to arrive on time so they can participate**
- 2. school-wide excessive attendance plan- we established a school-wide plan so all teachers know the steps to take when a child is experiencing excessive absences.**
- 3. newsletters & call outs to families- we will provide frequent reminders of the importance of regular attendance**
- 4. communication log- we will implement a google doc that lists the school-home communication for each teacher. There is a specific section for attendance. In addition to teachers, other staff members have access to the log so they can make phone calls, provide support, and also monitor communication and the results of actions taken to improve attendance**

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous tasks 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. Specifically, the teachers follow the District's Scope and Sequence, and utilize resources from Blender to ensure alignment to Florida State Statute. 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 expectations for academic and social emotional success. These Universals are explicitly taught in the beginning of the year and then revisited often, especially before and after holidays. Classrooms also incorporate Universals into social contracts. This enables classroom communities to establish agreements for how they will treat each other. We communicate these expectations with families via newsletters, parent conferences, family events, etc. We also monitor SwPBS at our committee meeting, utilizing data (referral data, SEL survey data, etc.). The committee is comprised of representatives from different grade levels, and it also has non-instructional members. This way, all voices from across the school are heard.

In alignment to school board 2.09 and Florida State Statute 1003.42, our school addresses multicultural diversity within the curriculum, classroom libraries, and the arts.

Within the curriculum, our students are explicitly taught through standards-based instruction. This explicit curriculum is taught during social studies and/or integrated into the literacy block. Our students also attend field trips and/or school presentations that highlight multicultural diversity.

Our students also participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, music studied during Fine Arts, art projects and lessons during Fine Arts. Our K-2 teachers have partnered with teaching artists, in order to integrate arts into literacy. Often the art product represents multicultural diversity. These activities as well as work products from the classroom often reflect the identity of individual students. Allowing students to see themselves in art, music, writing, etc.

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.

Faculty/Staff: Ensuring that every member of the faculty and staff feel that they are supported by leadership in a professional community that values innovation, growth and collegiality. Teachers and administrators who feel professionally stimulated and supported are more present for their students and actively seek ways to engage them creatively and positively. Provide a robust approach to social-emotional learning with students that nurtures a growth mindset, builds positive relationships with adults and peers, and fosters the emotional safety necessary for students to focus on their learning.

Students: Building student ownerships is the cornerstone to success. You must be willing to interact with your students. Get to know them as individuals. This will not only establish trust, but allow you to recognize their strengths and understand where they may need help or guidance. Students are also likely to work harder for adults when they believe said adults have their best interest at heart.

Engaging families: Research shows that a higher level of parental involvement leads to increased student achievement at all levels, and involved families impact student attendance, performance, social skills, and post-secondary training.

School-wide Positive Behavior is used to encourage students' academic and behavioral success. To celebrate success, the students will receive student paws, incentives, certificates, and calls/notes home. To highlight teachers' contributions to students' success, the School-wide Positive Behavior Team will provide teacher give aways, shout outs, inspirational quotes, and gratitude slips.

Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.

Lantana Elementary also teaches Social Emotional Learning. This is done through Morning Meeting, 2nd Step Curriculum, as well as SEL competencies that are integrated into content areas, across the day.

Faculty and Staff members also engage in Adult SEL. Tips for self-care are provided, mini trainings on resiliency, stress management, and other topics are provided. Also, we utilize Engagement Practices at every PLC and meeting with Faculty and Staff.

Student Support:

- Data Chats
- Small Group Counseling sessions
- Guidance Lunch Bunch
- Behavioral Health Professional
- SEL
- Character Counts
- Character Building Clubs (SECME, Green Team, Recycling)

-Mentoring

Engaging Families:

-Parent Trainings monthly

-SAC

-Parent Nights- Winter Concert, STEAM Night, Read & Treat

-Parent Communication: call outs, newsletter, Dojo, social media

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				\$472.74
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	0751 - Lantana Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	520.0	\$472.74
			<i>Notes: Pending SAC approval</i>			
					Total:	\$472.74