

The School District of Palm Beach County

# South Grade Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

| Table of Contents              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Demographics            | 3  |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 23 |

## South Grade Elementary School

716 S K ST, Lake Worth, FL 33460

<https://sges.palmbeachschools.org>

### Demographics

**Principal: Ana Arce Gonzalez**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2017

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Native American Students*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (50%)<br>2017-18: C (46%)<br>2016-17: D (40%)<br>2015-16: C (46%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/21/2020.

## 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              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 23 |

## South Grade Elementary School

716 S K ST, Lake Worth, FL 33460

<https://sges.palmbeachschools.org>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 99%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 97%  |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/21/2020.

### 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.**

South Grade Elementary is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

South Grade Elementary envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural 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  |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Arce Gonzalez, Ana | Principal           | Leads and provides the common vision for the school to make data driven decisions when implementing the RTI in the school.   |
| Barr, Loris        | Assistant Principal | Mirrors the vision of the principal by supporting the RTI-SBT process.   |
| Marshall, Linda    | Instructional Coach | The reading coach stays current on research and best practices to analyze and support the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student needs, utilizing district resources to develop effective based intervention strategies. The coach uses student assessments and monitoring data to promote progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis. Participates with the schools professional development team to create and implement quality and staff development for specific instructional areas of weaknesses. The coach participates in school professional learning communities by grade level K--5. |
| Clark, Celia       | Instructional Coach | Supports the operations of learning, culture and systemic communities.   |
| Garcia, Anna       | Teacher, K-12       | The ESOL Coordinator manages all ELL data, resources, assessments and interventions that supports classroom teachers, students, and parents.   |
| Burritt, Heather   | Teacher, K-12       | The SBT Leader manages all SBT cases and supports staff and teachers with delivering precise interventions in the classroom.   |
| Arbesfeld, Francis | Instructional Coach | The DL coach stays current on research and best practices to analyze and support the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student needs, utilizing district resources to develop effective based intervention strategies. The coach uses student assessments and monitoring data to promote progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis. Participates with the schools professional development team to create and implement quality and staff development for specific instructional areas of weaknesses. The coach participates in school professional learning communities by grade level K--5.      |
| Fenn, Martina      | Instructional Coach | The reading coach stays current on research and best practices to analyze and support the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student needs, utilizing district resources to develop effective based intervention strategies. The coach uses student assessments and monitoring data to promote progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis. Participates with the schools professional development team to create and implement quality and staff development for specific instructional areas of weaknesses. The coach participates in school professional learning communities by grade level K--5. |
| Wilcock, Donna     | Instructional Coach | The math coach stays current on research and "best practice" to analyze and support the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction. The math   |



| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------|-------|---|
|      |       | coach identifies systematic patterns of student needs utilizing district resources to develop effective evidence based intervention strategies. The coach uses students assessments and monitoring data to promote progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis. The coach participates with the schools professional development team to create and implement quality staff development for specific instructional areas of weakness. The coach participates in school professional learning communities in grades K-5. |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 8/13/2017, Ana Arce Gonzalez

**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.*

8

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

17

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

67

#### Demographic Data

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Native American Students*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (50%)                         |
|  | 2017-18: C (46%)                         |
|  | 2016-17: D (40%)                         |
|  | 2015-16: C (46%)                         |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast                                |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a> |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A                                      |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I                                     |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |  |

## 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               | 62          | 106 | 114 | 113 | 133 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 633   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 45  | 34  | 32  | 59  | 29  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 199   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 8   | 46  | 50  | 72  | 51  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 227   |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 2   | 26  | 41  | 44  | 28  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 141   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 13  | 30  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 10  | 24  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| FY20 Math Diag Levels 1 & 2               | 0           | 0   | 0   | 77  | 53  | 61  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 191   |
| FY20 ELA Diag Levels 1 & 2                | 0           | 0   | 0   | 98  | 65  | 80  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 243   |

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           | 5 | 33 | 41 | 62 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 194   |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 39    |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/27/2020

**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     | 0           | 115 | 108 | 132 | 108 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 597   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 20          | 12  | 8   | 10  | 7   | 18  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75    |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 1   | 0   | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 75          | 85  | 97  | 106 | 58  | 81  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 502   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 80  | 56  | 83  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 219   |

**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 | 13          | 6 | 6 | 77 | 44 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 205   |

**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 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| 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     | 0           | 115 | 108 | 132 | 108 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 597   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 20          | 12  | 8   | 10  | 7   | 18  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75    |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 1   | 0   | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 75          | 85  | 97  | 106 | 58  | 81  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 502   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 80  | 56  | 83  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 219   |

**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 | 13          | 6 | 6 | 77 | 44 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 205   |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 39    |

## 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             | 32%    | 58%      | 57%   | 23%    | 53%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 55%    | 63%      | 58%   | 42%    | 59%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 56%    | 56%      | 53%   | 52%    | 55%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 52%    | 68%      | 63%   | 46%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 66%    | 68%      | 62%   | 44%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59%    | 59%      | 51%   | 53%    | 53%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 27%    | 51%      | 53%   | 21%    | 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 | 24%    | 54%      | -30%                       | 58%   | -34%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 30%    | 56%      | -26%                       | 57%   | -27%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 32%    | 62%      | -30%                       | 58%   | -26%                    |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 24%    | 58%      | -34%                       | 56%   | -32%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 27%    | 59%      | -32%                       | 56%   | -29%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 24%    | 59%      | -35%                       | 55%   | -31%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 39%    | 65%      | -26%                       | 62%   | -23%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 47%    | 63%      | -16%                       | 62%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 57%    | 67%      | -10%                       | 64%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 38%    | 63%      | -25%                       | 62%   | -24%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 19%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 43%    | 65%      | -22%                       | 60%   | -17%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 56%    | 66%      | -10%                       | 61%   | -5%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -13%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 23%    | 51%      | -28%                       | 53%   | -30%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 27%    | 56%      | -29%                       | 55%   | -28%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 26       | 59     | 78          | 48        | 74      | 67           | 15       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 29       | 56     | 55          | 51        | 67      | 60           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 31       | 57     | 58          | 45        | 63      | 57           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 33       | 54     | 53          | 54        | 67      | 60           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 40       |        |             | 30        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 32       | 56     | 56          | 52        | 66      | 59           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 25       | 55     | 61          | 36        | 47      | 56           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 29       | 55     | 53          | 52        | 54      | 50           | 23       |         |           |                   |                     |
| AMI                                       | 26       | 39     |             | 50        | 59      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 34       | 63     | 64          | 42        | 60      | 43           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 29       | 52     | 54          | 56        | 55      | 59           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 31       | 25     |             | 46        | 38      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 29       | 51     | 57          | 53        | 56      | 51           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 13       | 32     | 38          | 39        | 54      | 61           | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 17       | 35     | 51          | 46        | 44      | 52           | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| AMI                                       | 11       | 29     |             | 34        | 53      |              | 11       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 56     | 82          | 43        | 48      | 53           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 23       | 40     | 44          | 49        | 39      | 45           | 24       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 36       |        |             | 43        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 23       | 41     | 52          | 46        | 44      | 54           | 22       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 50   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 50   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 397  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 51   |
| 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                                      | 49  |
| 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                                | 51  |
| 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  | 50  |
| 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   | 35  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

According to the comparison of FY19 FSA to FY20 Diagnostics, the ELL population has the lowest achievement performance in ELA. which is not a typical trend for the ELL population in Math. Specifically, the female Hispanic subgroup showed the lowest performance. This subgroup dropped 7% from previous year FSA. This is a trend because we have historically had large populations of ELL students. The ELL male Hispanic subgroup increased from 11% FY19 FSA to 24% FY20 Diagnostics. The ELA decline was mostly evident in 3rd grade with our Hispanic and White students and in 5th grade with our White students. The contributing factor is the need to support all learners through differentiation. We need to develop our teachers to utilize instructional differentiation in a strategic manner. Due to the lack of data for FY20 because of state mandated school closure with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue with our FY20 goals of increasing 5% in ELA.

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

According to the comparison of FY19 Diagnostic to FY20 Diagnostic, fourth grade math had the greatest decline from 61.8% achievement to 50% achievement. The Hispanic, Black and SWD subgroups showed considerable declines as well (Hispanic - 67% to 52%; Black - 63% to 30%; SWD - 78% to 50%).

The contributing factor: the previous 4th grade class performed exceedingly well in achievement, gains and lowest 25%. The current 4th grade class, although they showed growth from 3rd grade to 4th grade, they did not out perform the previous 4th grade class causing a decrease in performance, comparing FY19 to FY20. Teachers were also introduced to a new Math curriculum resource. More time is needed to better understand how to implement the new adaptations of the resource.

#### 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.

Traditionally, ELA FSA and Science achievement proficiency results have the largest gap compared to district and state averages (ELA State 57% compared to school 32% and Science State 53% compared to school at 27%). As compared to the FY20 Diagnostic, ELA results showed an increase of 9% and Science 17%. The complexity of the text in ELA and Science continues to be a challenge for our ELL students who make up 78% of our population. ELA learning gains has also traditionally shown a gap of about 8-10% difference as compared to the district and/or state; however; ELA lowest 25% has shown equal results as compared to the district and/or state.



Another contributing factor was that the ELA coach was utilized to support beginning teachers throughout the year which lessen the amount of support for other homeroom teachers.

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

The area that has consistently demonstrated the most improvement has been Math. Comparing FY18 to FY19 Math FSA students increased 11% in learning gains and 6% lowest 25%. As compared to the FY20 Diagnostic students increased 3% in achievement.

All subgroups with the exception of Black female (40% decrease to 37%) and SWD female (45% to 33%) had a substantial increase in math performance.

Contributing factor: Closely progress monitoring student groupings and intense analysis of data during PLC and grade level meetings. More deliberate planning would need to be done to better support our SWD students and black females to allow for more foundational instruction leading up to learning a new concept.

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

An area of concern is the course failures for both ELA/Math components is significantly a large amount of the grade level student population. This is a standard based report card which doesn't reflect the growth ELL and SWD students are doing which accounts for the majority of our students population. Therefore, if the student is not performing on grade-level it would appear that the students are under performing with a grading code of ND (needs development). This grading system does not reflect the amount of time it takes a second language learner to obtain standard mastery language.

As well the Level 1 on state assessments is exceedingly high across grades 3-5. When students score a level 1 it indicates that students are performing below the grade level standard or well below the grade level standard. Although it creates for more opportunities to receive intensive services, it does pressure the ELL student to have to learn at a much faster pace than their non-ELL peers and pushes teachers to conduct more progress monitoring of student performance as well as possibly forcing teachers to begin looking at students for any processing issues or learning deficiencies when in fact they just need time to process the language.

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

At South Grade we focus on student achievement, learning gains, lowest 25% and overall social emotional learning. It is understood as described in the district strategic plan that 3rd grade proficiency is our main priority as we leverage all of our work with students in grades K-2 and 3-5. This accounts for our ESSA White subgroup and all other subgroups that make up the majority of our students.

1. Third grade proficiency accounts for all the students who have been able to master on grade level reading standards. By making this our first priority, it allows us to keep the vision of supporting our younger grades socially, academically and developmentally. By considering the most effective interventions and capturing the needs of students early, it will allow for more effective outcomes. Putting in place the right services and catching deficiencies at an early stage will create a more continuous best practice.
2. K-2 ELA proficiency is also at the core of every PD we do with teachers. Many of our students begin school with a deficit in oral language. It is a component to literacy that we incorporate in every subject and lesson we do. For ELL learners, the visual, hands-on practice and oral language support is above all an essential resource that needs to be included throughout the student day.
3. Science Mastery continues to be an ongoing challenge for our students due to the complexity of vocabulary and concept. Building a science lab to go along with lessons is a non-negotiable to help students understand concepts, definitions/terms, and exploration better. We will continue to provide

students with as many opportunities to construct deep understanding of concepts outside the textbook.

4. Lowest 25% ELA/Math students are our targeted students who require the most intervention and services. These students are closely monitored to assure that intense interventions are working and developing academic student growth. Providing differentiated standard based instruction along with identifying the best method of instruction is at the core of our planning for these students.

5. Differentiation of standard based instruction has no limits when understanding the urgency of student needs. With the ELL spectrum for learning, instruction requires a different lift, presentation or accommodation depending on the number of years students have been in school and acquiring the english language. Our daily PLC meetings will continue to help us explore, as educators, best practices that will support our students best within their ELL categories.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

## #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | <p>If we provide effective and relevant instruction to White and Hispanic subgroups and all students to ensure an increase in reading on grade level by 3rd grade.</p> <p>According to ESSA the white subgroup performed below the 41% indicator and the remaining Hispanic male/female subgroup have declined significantly. The contributing factor is the need to support all learners through differentiation. We need to develop our teachers to utilize instructional differentiation in a strategic manner.</p> <p>Our school had a 3% decline in the Black subgroup for ELA proficiency and 6% decline in learning gains and lowest 25%. The white subgroup also declined from 46% to 30% in math proficiency. The contributing factor is the need to support all learners through differentiation. We need to develop our teachers to utilize instructional differentiation in a strategic manner.</p> |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. White students will increase from 10% from 40% to 50% ELA proficiency</li> <li>2. Black subgroup students will increase from 31% to 41% ELA proficiency</li> <li>3. Science for all students will increase from 27% to 37% proficiency</li> <li>4. ELL subgroup students will increase 5% in proficiency 29% to 34%, learning gains 56% to 61% and lowest 25% 55% to 60%</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Ana Arce Gonzalez (ana.arce-gonzalez@palmbeachschools.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Differentiated small group instruction using AVID to support rigor, instruction, collaboration and culture</li> <li>2. Teacher providing clear and effective learning feedback (i.e., teacher/student data chat including setting up goals and objectives)</li> <li>3. Using complex text and questions to support student engagement and collaboration</li> <li>4. Reciprocal teaching and allowing students to fully engage in their own learning</li> <li>5. Hands-on science labs for fifth grade students</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Using differentiated instruction through content, process, process and learning environment would meet the needs of the different learners.</li> <li>2. Data driven instruction, progress monitoring, and accountability of subgroups during PLCs will help target the white, black and all students to meet individual needs.</li> <li>3. In order to increase proficiency the engagement and collaboration among students is directly aligned to high learning outcomes.</li> <li>4. By providing the hands-on science lab it will produce rich understanding of vocabulary. engagement and science standard components.</li> </ol>   |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Deliverable professional development to include differentiated instruction (i.e., small group guided, strategy and skill work) (PD Team)
2. Identified students with reading deficiency(ies) will receive SAI, RTI, LLI remediation/intervention support (Coaches)
3. Purposeful resource such as Fountas/Pinnell will be used to guide teachers in developing effective and efficient lessons (PD Team)
4. During PLC, teachers and coaches will analyze data to include next step approaches. (Coaches)

5. Throughout the school year, SEL is being supported by Morning Meeting implementation and on-site mental health team to deliver school-wide positive behavior systems (i.e., PBS/Safety Committee meets monthly to ensure progress monitoring of systems and problem/solution interventions). (PBS/Mental Health Care Team)

**Person Responsible**    Loris Barr (loris.barr@palmbeachschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan and with the goal to increase the academic instruction of all students, students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of 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 school climate with an appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. policy 2.09 with a focus on the instruction of the**

**\*History of the Holocaust,**

**\*History of African Americans,**

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

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

**Within our school, teachers will articulate, demonstrate, and teach the specific practices that reflect the application of the school's SwPBS guidelines of Social Emotional Learning, showcased by our Morning Meetings. This is a daily ritual where students practice and are being taught how to assume responsible, respectful, and ready to learn behaviors. We have universal guidelines that are captured and taught by staff. Every morning on the school news, the principal reviews these universal guidelines and celebrates exemplar classrooms and students.**

**This past year South Grade Elementary was recognized with the PBIS Model School Gold Status. This recognition is aligned to the implementation of positive behavioral interventions and supports within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). The focus is to promote positive behavior in school, relationship-building and de-escalation strategies. Students earn Surfer tickets when they follow the school rules and guidelines which then allows students to redeem them at our school store. Teachers and staff truly enjoy recognizing students throughout their day, as students equally demonstrate their motivation when receiving Surfer tickets. As well, our lunch program favors students each month. Each day, classes earn points. At the end of the month, the class with the most points is recognized on the school news, weekly staff newsletter and receive a redemption prize for their cafeteria behavior.**

**South Grade Elementary has a multicultural committee made up staff members who meet monthly on how to best celebrate diversity at the school. Examples of events and activities arranged by this committee include the following: Multicultural Show - different classes showcase different countries around the world with song and dances; meetings and trainings for parents; Hispanic Heritage month trivia and activities on the morning news**

**The school also has a Care Team that attends to behavioral and mental health of students. This team collaborates weekly and identifies interventions and strategies for students and families that need greater assistance at home and/or school. This team is comprised of school administration, mental health therapist, co-located therapist, school counselor and ESE coordinator.**

**Our parent liaison along with city agencies also provide additional resources (e.g., food, clothing, toiletries, supplies, backpacks) to our families who have greater needs. Families are also given additional items during our parent trainings and informational meetings.**

**Our school also has a Safe School Ambassadors Program. These opinion leader students work quietly and courageously to de-escalate conflict, reduce incidents of deliberate exclusion, social cruelty, and bullying, on campus whether in person or online. Our school guidance**

**Grade level leader facilitators and coaches ensure the effective implementation of State requirements statute requirements.**

## 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.

School-wide Positive Behavior is used to encourage students' academic and behavioral success. To celebrate that success students may choose from a reward board which includes choices like lunch with the teacher, classroom scavenger hunt, choose the look of the teacher's bitmoji, etc. Certificates, individual surfer tickets and incentives will be offered campus wide as a way to reward good choices. To highlight teachers' contributions to students' success, the School-wide Positive Behavior Team will provide incentives to teachers throughout the year for going above and beyond.

South Grade Elementary is very supportive with assisting parents at school and/or in the home. Office staff and teachers make daily/weekly home visits with providing parents student academic assistance. As well, we monitor attendance closely and weekly, conduct home visits to encourage students to attend school. Students are recognized weekly for perfect attendance. Any attendance concerns are addressed with the school-based team that meets weekly. When appropriate, the attendance clerk meets with the parent and creates a plan of action (contract) on how to best resolve the attendance concern.

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. This will be taught through the school's SEL classes that will be on a rotation provided by the SEL team. In addition the morning announcements will emphasize the character development focus for the month on a daily basis.

Students at South Grade Elementary are given the opportunity to learn college and career readiness skills in 4th and 5th grade. This program teaches students how to be more organized, how to take notes, shows them study skills, helps build relational capacity, sets high expectations, allows students to collaborate, ask and answer inquiry type questions, and fosters a safe environment for students. Elementary students develop the academic habits they will need to be successful in middle school, high school, and college, in an age-appropriate and challenging way.

With the additional support of student mental health interns, we are able to provide students the social/emotional support needed to cope with daily life circumstances. We have two play therapy rooms that have been designed to help students feel comfortable as they work on strategies to support social/emotional concerns. The toys and materials in the therapy room have an effect on the type and amount of expression and interaction with the therapist.

### 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.

|               |               |   |  |                          |     |                 |
|---------------|---------------|---|--|--------------------------|-----|-----------------|
| <b>1</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups</b> |  |                          |     | <b>\$718.82</b> |
|               | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus   | Funding Source           | FTE | 2020-21         |
|               | 3336          | 500-Materials and Supplies  | 2431 - South Grade Elementary School   | School Improvement Funds |     | \$718.82        |
|               |               |   | <i>Notes: Provide systems of supports to ensure all needs of students are being met.</i> |                          |     |                 |
| <b>Total:</b> |               |   |  |                          |     | <b>\$718.82</b> |