Acreage Pines Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Acreage Pines Elementary School

14200 ORANGE BLVD, Loxahatchee, FL 33470

https://apes.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Darlene Karbowski

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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)	62%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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.](http://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

Acreage Pines Elementary School

14200 ORANGE BLVD, Loxahatchee, FL 33470

https://apes.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	54%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

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.

Acreage Pines Community Elementary is committed to providing students with a safe and challenging academic environment where each child can reach their highest potential and succeed in the global community by developing citizenship, accountability, respect, and exploration in the fields of Biomedical and Veterinary Technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Acreage Pines Elementary is growing respectful, inquiring, global learners within a happy, caring and stimulating environment where children will recognize and achieve their fullest potential, so that they can be successful within society.

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
Karbowski, Darline	Principal	The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Kolesar, Corrie	Teacher, K-12	As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between a school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's meetings, organizational practices, parent communication, and grade-wide activities.
Garrett, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between a school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's meetings, organizational practices, parent communication, and grade-wide activities.
Montez, Nina	Assistant Principal	The role of assistant principal is to support the principal to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
LaVigna, Christie	Teacher, K-12	As media specialist, responsible for ensuring students and staff are effective and ethical users of ideas and information. Empowering students to be critical thinkers, enthusiastic readers, skillful researchers, and ethical users of information.
Schlosser, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between a school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's meetings, organizational practices, parent communication, and grade-wide activities.
Gamble (Abrams), Giana	Teacher, K-12	As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between a school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's meetings, organizational practices, parent communication, and grade-wide activities.
Ohm, Jennifer	School Counselor	To work with teachers and parents to make sure that students have the proper tools and guidance to effectively learn within their skill sets. They also ensure that curricula and programs address the social motional, developmental and educational needs of students.
Goolsby, Regina	Teacher, PreK	As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between a school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and coordinate the grade-level team's meetings, organizational practices, parent communication, and grade-wide activities.
Bermudez, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	To help each child with special learning needs progress in school and prepare for life after school. ESE services include specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of the child. ESE services may also include technology devices, therapy, special transportation, or other supports.
Serpenti, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between a school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's meetings, organizational practices, parent communication, and grade-wide activities.
Douglass, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between a school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's meetings, organizational practices, parent communication, and grade-wide activities.
Lanham, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between a school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's meetings, organizational practices, parent communication, and grade-wide activities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Darlene Karbowski

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

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)	62%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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	82	77	79	85	85	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	3	4	6	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	12	12	30	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in Math	0	8	3	15	21	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Level 1&2	0	0	0	30	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
FY20 MAth Winter Diag Level 1&2	0	0	0	25	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	5	7	19	19	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	3	2	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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 10/8/2020

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	72	86	95	83	66	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	22	14	10	6	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	30	28	23	21	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	4	9	4	11	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	2	6	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	86	95	83	66	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	22	14	10	6	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	30	28	23	21	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	4	9	4	11	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	58%	57%	67%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	63%	58%	57%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	56%	53%	55%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	68%	63%	76%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	68%	62%	65%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	59%	51%	57%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	51%	53%	46%	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	72%	54%	18%	58%	14%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	62%	-3%	58%	1%
	2018	69%	58%	11%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	64%	59%	5%	56%	8%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	80%	65%	15%	62%	18%
	2018	68%	63%	5%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	67%	3%	64%	6%
	2018	75%	63%	12%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	63%	65%	-2%	60%	3%
	2018	66%	66%	0%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	51%	10%	53%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	43	49	48	50	54	39	44				
BLK	68	43		73	79						
HSP	64	49		72	56	25	52				
WHT	68	61	42	71	68	28	64				
FRL	59	49	38	63	53	34	59				

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	35	29	30	45	50	53	17				
ASN	67	82		82	90						
BLK	65	54		65	69						
HSP	66	51	42	66	46	46	50				
WHT	68	54	30	72	55	50	58				
FRL	63	59	38	62	51	31	52				

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	60	55	44	44	43	27				
ELL				73							
BLK	53	64		64	75		36				
HSP	66	56		78	71	67	43				
WHT	71	53	60	76	56	38	51				
FRL	59	49	42	69	60	53	40				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	66
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	53
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	57
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Based on data trends from SY19 FSA ELA and Math student achievement in proficiency for both subjects is a consistent area of opportunity for the ESE population. Contributing factors for this gap may relate back to instructional delivery and additional support that meet the needs of this group. SY 20 interim data showed based on winter diagnostics showed that this group continued to be an area for focus. The bottom quartile which primarily encompasses the ESE population showed that gains were improving, but still well below that of gen ed students. With 35% making gains in Math compared to 57% in Gen Ed population. For ELA the population making learning gains was 48% compared to 65% for the general population.

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

Based on the SY19 FSA, Math learning gains for the bottom quartile showed the largest decrease with a 19%
decline from 50% to 31%. A contributing factor to this is meeting the needs of the ESE
subgroup which largely makes up the bottom quartile. Based on the SY 20 diagnostic Math learning
gains continued to be an area of opportunity with 57% of all students predicted to make gains and

35% of the bottom quartile predicted to make gains. Using FY 20 winter diagnostic data compared to the FY 19 Math FSA, only 66% of students were predicted to be proficient in Math compared to 72% on the SY 19 FSA.

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.

Math learning gains for the bottom quartile also showed the biggest gap between state performance and school performance based on the SY19 Math FSA. Learning gains in Math among the cohort moving from grade 4 to grade 5 continually show opportunity.. State data was not available for the SY 20 FSA. How ever based on available grade simulation data released by the DOE, he school grade was expected to remain a B with a slight decrease of 2 percentage points.

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

Based on SY19 FSA,Science achievement continued to show the largest gain for the second year in a row
increasing 6% in the past year and 15% over the past two years. A focus on tutorial,
changes to the master schedule and incorporation of science curriculum in the after
school program were contributing factors. Based on FY 20 Winter diagnostic data the percentage of students school-wide making learning gains in ELA showed a vast improvement. with an 8% increase in the students making learning gains. This increase can be attributed utilizing a new school-wide instructional focus calendar and additional iReady resources.

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

An area of concern based on EWS is attendance.In SY19 15% of the student body in grades K-5 missed 10 days of school or more. In SY20 that number was 16%, that same EWS was Factoring in tardies and early dismissals makes the amount of missed instructional time even more detrimental. Often times the students
missing instruction are SWD and bottom quartile students. Attendance continued to be a concern both before and after COVID in the SY 20 school year. With 82 students (15%) attending less than 90% of the instructional days.

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

Based on analysis of FSA data from SY 18, SY19 and winter diagnostic SY 20. the following areas continue to be a concern.
1. Math learning gains bottom quartile
2. ELA learning gains Bottom quartile
3. ELA learning gains
4. Math learning gains
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on SY 19 FSA Math learning gains for the bottom 25% decreased 19%. This group is comprised largely of SWD and FRL. It is necessary for this group to make adequate gains to begin to close the achievement gap and move toward proficiency. Diagnostic data from SY20 showed just 35% of bottom quartile students predicted to make learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students making learning gains in the bottom quartile for math will increase 20%. This falls in line with the district Strategic Plan/strategic theme: effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students. The objective is to establish personalized learning opportunities for all students, as well as the initiative:provide instructional programming customized to the individual strengths,needs, interests, and aspirations of each learner as most appropriate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing high quality classroom instruction via a rotational model with emphasis on small group instruction, number talks, and use of SuccessMaker as adaptive learning for intervention, differentiation, and personalization of learning path. This facilitates the natural progression of the Concrete-Representational-Abstract Instructional Approach.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using adaptive technology can enhance mathematics learning and supports effective mathematics teaching and skills practice. Well-designed mathematics interventions can increase student achievement, specifically in the acquisition and practice of basic skills, especially when integrated with classroom instruction (Parr, J. M., & Fung, I. 2000).

Action Steps to Implement

Review data, determine PD, and guide next steps, implementing standards-based instruction using a rotational model for instructional delivery.

Person Responsible	Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

Review the master schedule and put changes in place to optimize Math instructional time.

Person Responsible	Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

Analyze data from learning loss assessments and meet with teachers to develop an instructional plan to address gaps identified through the analysis.

Person Responsible	Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

Analyze data of the lowest 25% within grade 5, set attainable goals,and provide tutoring, and support as needed. Refer struggling students to SBT and into RTI process

Person Responsible	Nina Montez (nina.montez@palmbeachschools.org)

Utilize "look fors", visiting math classrooms biweekly. Provide feedback to teachers based on observations. Share exemplars and provide development opportunities for teachers in need.

Person Responsible Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA learning gains for the bottom 25% remained flat. These gains are significantly below the state and district average. This group is comprised largely of SWD and FRL. It is necessary for this group to make adequate gains to begin to close the achievement gap and move toward proficiency. Diagnostic data from SY20 showed a positive trajectory with 48% of bottom quartile students predicted to make gains in ELA and 65% of all students predicted to make gains.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students making learning gains in the bottom quartile for ELA will increase 10%. This falls in line with the district Strategic Plan/strategic theme: effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students. The objective is to establish personalized learning opportunities for all students, as well as the initiative: provide instructional programming customized to the individual strengths, needs, interests, and aspirations of each learner as most appropriate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing a balanced literacy format incorporating strategies and resources from iReady as adaptive technology, following the district scope and sequence, as well as utilizing resources from blender for instruction and independent practice, as well as differentiation to deliver high quality ELA classroom instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In balanced literacy, the teacher is able to provide whole language learning opportunities through interactive read-alouds, shared reading, interactive writing, and shared writing, while also providing explicit phonics instruction during both word study and guided reading time.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will attend professional development to hone their practice specifically in the areas of monitoring and grouping.

Person Responsible	Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

Teachers will be provided with training in word work, guided reading, Razkids and iReady

Person Responsible	Nina Montez (nina.montez@palmbeachschools.org)

PLC focus for grades 4 and 5 will be on writing. Best practices will be reviewed, differentiation of instruction, scope and sequence, and scoring with fidelity

Person Responsible	Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

Administration will continue walking through classrooms, focusing on standards-based instruction, independent reading time and use of complex text.

Person Responsible	Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

Monitoring will occur by meeting regularly with Intervention team members, reviewing the progress of lowest 25%, reviewing data from class assessments, FSQ, USA, otherdistrict assessments, iReady, and adjusting instruction.

Person Responsible   Nina Montez (nina.montez@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 Instruction will also be infused as applicable to appropriate grade levels including but not limited to:
(a) History of the Holocaust
(b) History of African and African Americans
(c) Women's Contribution
(d) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients
These concepts are introduced as stand alone teaching points and may also be integrated into other ore subjects: math, reading, social studies, science.
Teachers follow the scope and sequence as outlined on the Palm Beach County curriculum resource blender, This ensures that teachers have a concrete timeline as well as the resources to provide quality instruction on the mandated curriculum Additionally, topics are often addressed in greater depth though the school counselor during her instruction on the wheel and through special events held throughout the school year.
Attendance-An additional priority based on EWS is attendance. 15% of the student body in grades K-5
missed 10 days of school or more in 2019 and that umber was 16% in SY2020. Factoring in tardies and early dismissals makes the amount of missed instructional time even more detrimental. Often times the students
missing instruction are SWD and bottom quartile students. Through use of the PBS, attendance incentives and home to school communication this number shall be reduced. For the SY 21 attendance shall be counted for both students in brick and mortar, as well as distance 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.

Acreage Pines is approaching its 30th anniversary and it is a school that has roots deep in the community. We have many 2nd generation Foxes here on campus. The leadership of this school has built genuine relationships, has an open door policy and has earned the trust of a community that had previously seen their school as a revolving training center for principals. Our parents feel welcomed for special events and volunteering, but they are empowered to be part of decision making organizations such as SAC.
Acreage Pines Elementary is a biomedical and veterinary choice program. Our choice program attracts over 100 students to our school. Our school also includes a highly rated Pre-K program. Our choice program has been featured in several local and district publications. The choice program features a different thematic focus each trimester. The themes are Veterinary Sciences, Biomedical Sciences, and Wellness.
The school communicates with stakeholders through multiple modalities, including the school newsletter, parent link calls and texts, many social media platforms, choice programming tours and community events. Annual community events include the Fall festival, Spring Bling, chorus concerts and Winter field day.
Our annual career day attracts 75 community members and business partners annually to present to students about careers in the fields of biomedical and veterinary sciences.
Each year the number of business partners and community volunteers increases. We have see this upward trend continuously for the past 4 years.
We work collaboratively with our feeder middle schools and high schools. At the middle school level we often partner with the Veterinary Choice program that our students feed into, We participate together in community events, instructional opportunities, and program promotion. At he high school level, we participate by attending special game nights, working with the television production program and other community events to foster a sense of belonging and inspire high school readiness.
At Acreage Pines we actively participate in the Kids of Character program and have monthly incentives to honor students for positive behavior, Our school counselor, along with our school psychologist and behavioral health professional have created a website and a newsletter as a hub for the promotion of social emotional well-being and as a resource to students, parents and the community.
The school has many clubs to help all students feel that they have somewhere to belong. These organizations include clubs with academic focus, such as Third Grade Challengers, Academic Games and SECME; clubs with a focus on the arts, such as drama club , chorus, and art club; and a focus on wellness, such as the mileage club, the green club, a the two bite club. The school also has a large school safety patrol which has recently shifted to align with the high school volunteer requirements and to inspire students to give back to the community at a younger age.

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: Math				$275.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			2141 - Acreage Pines Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$275.00
			Notes: These funds will be used to provide after school tutorial This tutorial will begin no later than February 1, 2020 and will specifically target students from the SWD and FRL groups, as well as those in the bottom 25%.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$275.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			2141 - Acreage Pines Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$275.00
			Notes: These funds will be used to provide after school tutorial This tutorial will begin no later than February 1, 2020 and will specifically target students from the SWD and FRL groups, as well as those in the bottom 25%.			
					Total:	$550.00