Crosspointe Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Crosspointe Elementary School

3015 S CONGRESS AVE, Boynton Beach, FL 33426

https://cpes.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Annmarie Giddings Dilbert

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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

Crosspointe Elementary School

3015 S CONGRESS AVE, Boynton Beach, FL 33426

https://cpes.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

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

<div style="background-color:#1f2a5e; color:white; text-align:center;">

Part I: School Information

</div>

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Crosspointe's mission is to provide educational leadership, support, and resources to students that will allow for the design and implementation of an effective strategy rich environment across all academic areas to ensure college and career readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Crosspointe's vision is to be a leader in STEM education by preparing and inspiring generations of learners to meet the challenges of the global society through the Pillars of Effective Instruction. Crosspointe's vision also includes providing a culture of active engagement, real life connections, and the application of knowledge which focuses on scientific inquiry, innovation, collaboration, and creative problem solving in a rigorous standards-based interdisciplinary environment.

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
Dilbert, Annmarie	Principal	Administration supports and enforces School-Wide Positive Behavior. They conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure that effective learning is occurring. Administration also monitors data and tracks student progress through data chats with teachers, coaches, and students. The principal and assistant principal hold monthly faculty meetings, parent trainings, and attend professional development sessions. Administrators facilitate instructional meetings and participate in PLC's, common planning, and SBT meetings. They are very involved in parent communication and student achievement.
Arnold, Karen	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Arnold monitors data through Unify, EDW, Successmaker, and district assessments such as diagnostics, USA's, and FSQ's. She creates ongoing assessments that align with the standards being taught. In addition, she also tracks student progress through the implementation of student tracking forms that are analyzed with teachers. Mrs. Arnold provides ongoing professional development through PLC's, PDD, and common planning. She support teachers and students through the coaching cycle and organizes and implements tutorials. Mrs. Arnold develops school-wide content area events with the other coaches throughout the year to promote academic engagement and parent involvement.
North, Gina	Assistant Principal	Administration supports and enforces School-Wide Positive Behavior. They conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure that effective learning is occurring. Administration also monitors data and tracks student progress through data chats with teachers, coaches, and students. The principal and assistant principal hold monthly faculty meetings, parent trainings, and attend professional development sessions. Administrators facilitate instructional meetings and participate in PLC's, common planning, and SBT meetings. They are very involved in parent communication and student achievement.
Medina, Erica	Instructional Coach	Ms. Medina monitors data through Unify, EDW, iReady, and district assessments such as diagnostics, RRR, PBPA, USA's, and FSQ's. She creates ongoing assessments that align with the standards being taught. In addition, she also tracks student progress through the implementation of student tracking forms that are analyzed with teachers. Ms. Medina

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		provides ongoing professional development through PLC's, PDD, and common planning. She supports teachers and students through the coaching cycle and organizes and implements tutorials. Ms. Medina develops school-wide content area events throughout the year to promote academic engagement and parent involvement.
Hantman, Lauren	Instructional Coach	Ms. Hantman monitors data through Unify, EDW, iReady, FLKRS, and district assessments such as diagnostics, RRR, PBPA, USA's, and FSQ's. She creates ongoing assessments that align with the standards being taught. She also tracks student progress through the implementation of student tracking forms that are analyzed with teachers. Ms. Hantman provides ongoing professional development through PLC's, PDD, and common planning. In addition, she supports teachers and students through the coaching cycle and organizes and implements tutorials. Along with the other coaches she develops school-wide content area events throughout the year to promote academic engagement and parent involvement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/24/2014, Annmarie Giddings Dilbert

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.*
46

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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	79	110	115	108	84	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Attendance below 90 percent	25	30	12	5	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	1	8	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	25	72	43	61	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	209
Course failure in Math	7	12	67	30	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	47	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	31	37	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	7	15	62	27	20	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	5	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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 9/3/2020

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	120	119	97	122	120	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	711
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	4	8	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	2	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	33	50	62	71	80	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	28	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	7	5	2	33	32	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	4	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	120	119	97	122	120	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	711
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	4	8	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	2	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	33	50	62	71	80	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	28	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	7	5	2	33	32	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	4	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	54%	58%	57%	51%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	63%	58%	54%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	56%	53%	59%	55%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	61%	68%	63%	63%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	68%	62%	63%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	59%	51%	59%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	51%	53%	57%	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	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	62%	-3%	58%	1%
	2018	44%	58%	-14%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	50%	59%	-9%	56%	-6%
	2018	44%	59%	-15%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	65%	-9%	62%	-6%
	2018	45%	63%	-18%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	67%	6%	64%	9%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		28%				
05	2019	50%	65%	-15%	60%	-10%
	2018	49%	66%	-17%	61%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	51%	-12%	53%	-14%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	66	68	30	56	48	8				
ELL	46	65	63	55	66	59	32				
BLK	48	62	59	59	66	48	39				
HSP	60	61		66	74		42				
MUL	80			60							
WHT	73	88		68	76		50				
FRL	52	63	62	60	66	51	39				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	37	56	24	47	31	50				
ELL	33	52	48	42	48	38	47				
BLK	46	60	51	50	48	35	59				
HSP	45	42		45	64		58				
MUL	40			90							
WHT	50	58		52	58		55				
FRL	46	58	52	51	52	40	56				
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	21	43	54	32	43	31					
ELL	31	46	59	54	57	73	33				
BLK	52	55	55	63	65	59	58				
HSP	47	57		61	50		47				
MUL	50			80							
WHT	51	50		62	62		67				

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
FRL	50	53	59	62	63	60	57				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	56
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	55
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	62
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	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	71
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

When looking at the data our fifth grade Statewide Science Assessment (SSA) significantly decreased from 2018 to 2019 by 14.3%. The contributing factors were new curriculum with limited resources and new teachers to fifth grade science. High population of ELL students with a lack of

background knowledge.

Our District's Strategic Plan has a long term outcome of increasing on grade level reading by grade three to 75% by the year 2021. Our third grade students had a 46% proficiency rate on last years FSA. We need to increase this level in order to meet the district's long term outcome. Research shows that when students do not read on grade level by grade three their high school graduation rate is negatively affected therefore this is an important focus for our school.

Evidence:

On the district diagnostic assessment for FY20 ELA growth for grades three, four, and five all showed improvement towards our intended outcome. Third grade proficiency increased by .2, fourth grade by 1.8, and fifth grade by 2 compared to the FY19 district diagnostic. In addition, our proficiency rates on the iReady winter diagnostic increased from 21% in the fall to 37% this winter. Furthermore, we decreased the percentage of students at risk (significantly below grade level) from 26% to 16%.

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

When looking at the data our fifth grade Statewide Science Assessment (SSA) significantly decreased from 2018 to 2019 by 14.3%. The contributing factors were new curriculum with limited resources and new teachers to fifth grade science. High population of ELL students with a lack of background knowledge.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our science proficiency had the greatest gap where we needed 13% points to meet state proficiency average. This was attributed to new curriculum with limited resources and new teachers to fifth grade science. High population of ELL students with a lack of background knowledge.

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

Math increased 9% points and this was attributed to common planning between math grade levels and implementation of standards-based instruction tailored to the needs of students. We focused heavily on small group instruction and monitoring student progress.

Action Steps:

During PLC's all grade levels identified students to target based on assessment results, broken down by standard. Strategic plans for small group instruction were created based on these results with focus on secondary benchmarks. Monitoring of target students will continue during PLC's, team planning, and data chats.

1. Students will be remediated and enriched through small skill groups, digital learning opportunities, tutorial programs, and additional reading support outside of the 90-minute literacy block. Students will focus on standards that have not been mastered through small group instruction. Continue use of iReady and Waggle to enhance their skills through digital learning. Tutorial sessions for our ELL students are ongoing. Students are exposed to LLI, Lively Letters, and other reading interventions from the iReady toolkit to sharpen their reading skills beyond the reading block.

Coaches will help support teachers with the planning process, differentiating instruction, and with small groups. Administration will oversee and monitor progress for the duration of the school year.

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

When looking at the early warning systems two potential areas of concern are the number of students with course failures in ELA and math (especially in grades 3 and 4) and the number of level 1 students on the statewide assessment in grade 5.

To remediate these issues Coaches will help support teachers with the planning process, differentiating instruction, and with small groups. Administration will oversee and monitor progress for the duration of the school year.

2. ELA teachers will engage in standards-based instruction cycle during the collaborative planning (1) What do students need to know and understand (Plan) - deliberate planning will go into the needs of individual students based on assessment results; (2) How do we teach effectively to ensure all students are learning - use various methods to teach content - hands-on, technology, visuals, and differentiated instruction. (Do); (3) How do we know students are learning (Reflect) - monitor by observations, daily lessons, and formative assessments; (4) What do we do when students are not learning or reaching mastery before expectation (Revise) - reteach the strategy within small groups. Teachers will analyze standards and test item specifications during the planning process.

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

1. Science Coach will monitor data weekly to assist teachers with secondary benchmark calendars and provide professional development if needed. Teachers will attend bi-weekly PLCs where they will look at current data, go over assessments and upcoming lesson plans. In addition to this science standards will be integrated across all content areas and through Fine Arts (Stem). The goal is to increase the proficiency on the SSA.

2. The goal is to reduce the number of level one students on FSA ELA and Math in grades 3, 4 and 5. Literacy and Math Coaches will provide ongoing professional development, monitor data, identify small groups for reteaching and provide intense instruction to students that are identified through data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To ensure progress towards student achievement within ELA in alignment with the districts strategic plan to include LTO 1 and LTO 2. Rationale: ELA achievement in third grade is at 46% which is the lowest proficiency rate for ELA across grade levels. Though considerable growth has been made, our ELA scores have under performed district and state averages by 3-4% points.
Measurable Outcome:	Our measurable goals for FY21 will be to have a 13% increase in ELA proficiency as measured by the ELA FSA. This will be an increase of 51.78% to 65% in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Annmarie Dilbert (annmarie.dilbert@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Students will be remediated and enriched through small skill groups instruction using digital learning opportunities, tutorial programs, and additional reading support outside of the 90-minute literacy block. 2. Professional Learning Communities ensuring strtaegic focus and alignment to standards based instruction. ELA teachers will engage in standards-based instruction cycle during the collaborative planning (1) What do students need to know and understand (Plan); (2) How do we teach effectively to ensure all students are learning (Do); (3) How do we know students are learning (Reflect); (4) What do we do when students are not learning or reaching mastery before expectation (Revise). Teachers will analyze standards and test item specification during the planning process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The instruction cycle will foster collaboration and data-focused conversations to monitor student progress. By focusing on standards-based instruction in PLC's we can ensure that all students receive rigorous instruction and small group support to meet their needs. 2. Professional Learning Communities ensuring strtaegic focus and alignment to standards based instruction. ELA teachers will engage in standards-based instruction cycle during the collaborative planning (1) What do students need to know and understand (Plan); (2) How do we teach effectively to ensure all students are learning (Do); (3) How do we know students are learning (Reflect); (4) What do we do when students are not learning or reaching mastery before expectation (Revise). Teachers will analyze standards and test item specification during the planning process.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be remediated and enriched through small skill groups instruction using digital learning opportunities, tutorial programs, and additional reading support outside of the 90-minute literacy block.
1. Teachers and administration will analyze data to determine the needs and strengths of students to form small groups during the ELA block.
2. Students will keep journals or notebooks in which they write to explain, analyze, and reflect using question types and question stems from each of the FSA ELA reporting categories at least twice weekly across the four main content areas: ELA, math, science, and social studies.
3. Students will use accountable talk to explain their thinking and writing in small heterogeneous groups at

least once weekly across the four content areas.
4. Academic tutors / coaches will provide in classroom support for small group instruction.
5. Teachers will utilize engagement strategies learned through PLC's to promote active learning.
6. Monitoring will occur through data analysis, classroom observations, and lesson plans. (Literacy coaches)

Person Responsible   Gina North (gina.north@palmbeachschools.org)

Professional Learning Communities ensuring strategic focus and alignment to standards based instruction.
1. Develop a rotational schedule to ensure all teachers including resource teachers and fine arts participate in fine arts.
2. Data is analyzed to determine the focus of PLC's
3. Individual teacher secondary benchmarks are created from current performance data
4. Remediation or enrichment is provided to teachers through observations and coaching cycle
5. Teacher are taught to analyze student data to assist with and plan for instruction
6. Monitoring will occur through the coaching cycle and administrative walkthroughs (Literacy Coaches and Administrators

Person Responsible   Annmarie Dilbert (annmarie.dilbert@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our school will stay focused on the priorities and monitor progress toward the goals. In addition, we will enhance our service delivery models within inclusive settings. All State assessed grade-level courses will use the co-teacher service delivery model for inclusion and the other courses will use support facilitation for inclusion. The subgroup SWD will bemonitored closely as the gap between this subgroup and others is too large. Of critical importance, our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:
(a) History of Holocaust
(b) History of Africans and African Americans
(c) Hispanic Contributions
(d) Women's Contributions
(e) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients
Additional content required for instruction by Florida Statute 1003.42(2), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, include:
• Declaration of Independence
• Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights
• Federalist papers: Republican form of government
• Flag education
• Civil government: functions and interrelationships
• History of the United States
• Principles of Agriculture
• Effects of alcohol and narcotics
• Kindness to animals
• Florida history
• Conservation of natural res
resources
• Free enterprise
• 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.
Throughout this plan's implementation, single school culture and an appreciation of multicultural diversity is interwoven. We know that school climate is dependent on positive relationships, cultural sensitivity, as well as the instructional expectations and personalization necessary to meet the needs of every child that enable all students to reach their highest potential.
Our school is an SEL school and we recognize students cultures and diversity. The campus is surrounded with pictures of students and their families, representing all nationalities. Our cafeteria has flags representing all countries at our school as well as a mural that represents the diversity of our student population. When you first enter the building there is a huge world map with pictures of our students and staff next to their country of origin.

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.

Crosspointe Elementary is a diverse neighborhood school. We are a Title 1 school with many students and parents speaking other languages primarily Haitian Creole. Our parent community as well as the City of Boynton Beach work closely together to ensure that we are meeting the needs of our students. Crosspointe Elementary was recognized by the State and received the Family Involvement Award and our PTA won an award for Family and Community Involvement and Male Engagement.

80% of parents at Crosspointe Elementary School will attend Curriculum and Literacy Nights.
80% of parents of ELL students will attend Curriculum and Literacy Nights.
80% of parents of SWD students will attend Curriculum and Literacy Nights.
• Soliciting feedback from parents regarding their comfort level in contacting teachers and administrators with questions or problems;
• During Open House, curriculum night, etc. ensure non-threatening methods of introducing parents to teachers and administrators;
• Offer fun, interactive tutorials to parents who are unfamiliar with SIS and other forms of educational technology
• Communicate classroom and school news to parents;
• Offer Professional Development concerning effective strategies for conducting supportive and effective parent phone calls and face-to-face meetings
• Create the formats for inviting parent participation in the cultural education process;
• Positive notes, letters, phone calls home;
• Develop and implement a comprehensive school counseling program (Student Development Plan) with dedicated time to develop, implement and evaluate parent meetings/workshops on topics
such as developing school success skills, building a college-going culture through the Eight Components of College and Career Readiness (aspirations, academic planning, enrichment and extracurricular
engagement, college and career exploration and selection, college and career assessments, affordability planning, admissions and transitions into postsecondary), and developing growth mindsets in children.

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: ELA				$716.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	2731 - Crosspointe Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	651.1	$716.00
			Notes: Money will be used towards programs & processes towards student achievement.			
					Total:	$716.00