Grove Park Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Grove Park Elementary School

8330 N MILITARY TRL, West Palm Beach, FL 33410

https://gpes.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Marzella Mitchell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: F (30%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Grove Park Elementary School

8330 N MILITARY TRL, West Palm Beach, FL 33410

https://gpes.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	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission Statement: Grove Park Elementary is committed to guiding students to become advocates of excellence in their own learning. At Grove Park, we strive to customize instruction, infused with technology, for all unique learning styles. We celebrate the whole child, by fostering connections across a range of subjects. Parents, teachers, and students collaborate to further develop knowledge and attitudes that lead to global-mindedness and, college and career readiness.

In addition, Grove Park's mission aligns with the district's overall mission for students and school accountability:
The School District of Palm Beach County 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.

Grove Park's vision aligns with the district's overall vision for student achievement and school accountability: The School District of Palm Beach envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rogers, JoAnne	Principal	- School Accountability, Student Achievement Curriculum/Instructional/Assessment Alignment to Standards Progress Monitoring (Student Proficiency, Gains, Lowest 25%) Closing Achievement Gap Programs (IB Candidate School; Holiday Camps, Tutorials) Professional Development, School Sustainability (Formal & Embedded PD, Coaching, PLC) Highly Qualified Staff IB Candidate School Authorization Process - Family Involvement Trainings, related to core content areas Curriculum Nights and School Tours School Advisory Council (SAC) Strategies that address/reduce Absenteeism Partnerships Volunteerism - School Safety FortifyFL Koginto Crisis and Drill Compliance Systems, Routines of the Instructional Day swPBS (Climate, School Morale, Celebrations, Learner Profiles) Clubs (Enrichment): Ballet, Drumline, SECME, Leadership - Facilities Classroom Environments Maintenance Work Orders
Mitchell, Marzella	Assistant Principal	- School Accountability, Student Achievement Curriculum/Instructional/Assessment Alignment to Standards Progress Monitoring (Student Proficiency, Gains, Lowest 25%) Closing Achievement Gap Programs (IB Candidate School) Professional Development for School Sustainability (New Math Series, iReady, PLC) Highly Qualified Staff (New Teachers) Extended Learning Opportunities Assessment
Chernow, Tracy	Other	Student Diversity, Recruitment Program of Inquiry (horizontal and vertical planning) Professional Development (Coaching, Modeling, Embedded PD, Transdisciplinary Unit Development) Parent Involvement STEM Theme

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/9/2016, Marzella Mitchell

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: F (30%)
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	97	90	94	88	75	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	29	19	26	24	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	5	9	11	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	30	47	38	28	54	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Course failure in Math	0	19	29	2119	27	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2220
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	27	33	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	47	58	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165

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	21	28	28	22	28	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

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	40	4	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	3	2	3	10	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/20/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	14	14	13	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	5	11	3	13	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA or Math	40	44	33	43	36	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	36	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	10	15	11	35	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	95	105	87	70	85	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	17	14	14	13	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	5	11	3	13	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA or Math	40	44	33	43	36	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	36	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	10	15	11	35	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	39%	58%	57%	34%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	63%	58%	53%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	56%	53%	40%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	68%	63%	48%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	68%	62%	53%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	59%	51%	32%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	51%	53%	33%	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	34%	54%	-20%	58%	-24%
	2018	36%	56%	-20%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	62%	-24%	58%	-20%
	2018	31%	58%	-27%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	42%	59%	-17%	56%	-14%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	68%	65%	3%	62%	6%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	67%	-5%	64%	-2%
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	62%	65%	-3%	60%	2%
	2018	36%	66%	-30%	61%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	51%	-9%	53%	-11%
	2018	28%	56%	-28%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
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	23	50	33	45	74	70	25				
ELL	44	70	68	70	80	67	37				
BLK	35	60	67	62	73	70	39				
HSP	43	71	64	71	83		42				
FRL	38	63	65	64	76	68	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	18	31	19	20	38	38	18				
ELL	35	52	47	51	54		20				
BLK	34	52	55	41	41	30	29				
HSP	40	50	40	59	55		18				
WHT	55			45							
FRL	37	53	53	46	46	39	31				

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	8	41	30	16	27	29					
ELL	15	44	50	43	52	47	14				
BLK	32	50	41	42	53	32	33				
HSP	28	46	38	55	52	36	33				
WHT	64	90		64	60						
FRL	30	50	41	45	52	31	27				

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	62
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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	64
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	60
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	64
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
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.

Grove Park increased its school-letter grade from a "C" to a "B." Although there was a
slight increase in ELA from 37% in FY18 to 39% in FY19, ELA proficiency continues to be
the lowest performance measure as a trend.
2016, 24%
2017, 28%
2018, 37%
2019, 39% (compared to mathematics-66% and science-42%)
Contributing factors to GP's ELA growth trend are students entering third grade as struggling readers,
lack of word knowledge and ability to determine word meaning in context, understanding higher text
complexity, and overall stamina.
Overall increases include the following:
- 17.4 points in math achievement
- 30.5 points in math gains
- 30.2 points in Low 25 math gains
- 1.2 points in ELA achievement
- 11.9 points in ELA gains
- 13.4 points in Low 25 ELA gains
- 11.1 points in science achievement

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

ELA had the greatest gap when compared both to state averages and district averages.
District:
Proficiency 59%; Learning Gains, 57%; Lowest 25%, 47%
Grove Park, compared to state averages, by grade level:
Proficiency:
3rd Grade (GP 35%, state 58%)
4th Grade (GP 39%, state 58%)
5th Grade (GP 43%, state 56%)
Although trends show a gradual increase of ELA proficiency over the last four years from
24%, 28%, 37%, to 39%, the gap compared to the state's average is 23 points in 3rd grade;
19 points in 4th; and,
13 points in 5th
Factors that contribute to this gap:
- Students knowledge of the standards, lack of ability to make connections, vocabulary development,
stamina, and testing taking strategies.
- Teachers' lack of deep understanding of standards; and instructional delivery of high yielding
instructional strategies that increase students' mastery.

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.

ELA Proficiency, 39%
-Teacher capacity of the state standards
-Cultural Competence
-Lack of overall school readiness

-Parenting Influences
-Structural and institutional factors
-Lack of effective remediation od FSQ and USA

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

Math Gains-
2019-77%
2018-47%
- Standards-based Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, Resources, Materials
- Small Group Instruction
- Monitored Student Progress
- Extended School Day (additional time in ELA instruction)
- Teacher Collaboration and Planning
- Afterschool Tutorials (Weekdays, Saturdays, Spring Break)
-Expand knowledge in PLC of standards
-Enhance Teacher capacity with mentors and buddies
-Learning Walks of classes, and like schools

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

Increasing students learning gains and proficiency in Literacy will allow for our students to develop the skills necessary towards future success. Children who have developed strong reading skills perform better in school and have a healthier self-image. They become lifelong learners and sought-after employees. Lacking basic reading and writing skills is a tremendous disadvantage. Literacy not only enriches an individual's life, but it creates opportunities for people to develop skills that will help them provide for themselves and a better future.
Increasing students proficiency in Math helps us think analytically and have better reasoning abilities. Analytical thinking refers to the ability to think critically about the world around us.
Ensuring learning gains & progress for ESSA categorized sub groups: we will analyze student data to identify which students fall under various subgroup categories. Students who fall within our ESSA Subgroups will specifically be monitored for progress and receive additional support by teachers ensuring lessons are planned based on the specific needs of the students
Our focus is to increase student engagement so students become active learners in their own academic journey as they learn by doing and putting strategies into practice. It is our hope that students take ownership and foster independence through their engagement in their daily lessons. This focus will be ongoing and PD will be provided during staff meetings and on professional development days.

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

1. Science - There is a need to re-focus in science with an emphasis on implementation of content and deeper understanding. We need to provide additional support to help with achievement in this content area including but not limited to mentoring, tutorials, focused teacher planning/collaboration & professional development to ensure we meet the needs of all of our students in an equitable and accessible manner. Science needs to be a focus in grades K-5. We will still continue using the double down model to assist with increasing student achievement.
2. ELA and Math Continuum - During PLCs, we will focus on developing effective and relevant instruction through: unpacking standards, analyzing data, developing standards based lesson using vetted resources and materials from the District, share best practices, following/participating with the coaching continuum model, incorporate research based strategies included but not limited to GO-To Strategies, balanced literacy, small group instruction, and differentiated learning. Teachers will

engage in common planning as well as lesson study to improve instructional capacity. Professional development opportunities include district support/training, in-school coaching opportunities, and independent study. Teachers are encouraged to share best practice implementation at PLCs and Common Planning as a way of increasing grade level capacity as a whole. By developing strong teacher capacity, we are able to increase student achievement as well as close the achievement gap.

3.Reading Proficiency/ Low 25% Learning Gains - If we focus on a positive impact to learning gains by ensuring standards based instruction and effective the use of research-based strategies and resources, we will ensure student learning and improved student achievement towards grade level success and ensure continuous improvement. Early identification of our Low 25% will allow for ample tracking and support to ensure their growth. Low 25% students will be connected with a reading endorsed/certified interventionist to ensure closing of the achievement gap. In the past, these students have been identified based on their critical area of need and offered priority for afterschool and Saturday tutoring. We will be able to implement a tutoring program in the FY21 school year, either virtual or in person, these students will continue receiving priority for tutoring sessions that include math, ELA, and writing.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To ensure progress towards student achievement in ELA and Math to align with the District's Strategic Plan; Strategic Theme: Effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all learners; LTO # 1; increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade. Historically, our Gr. 3-5 ELA proficiency has very slowly increased, and only this year did we reach 39% Gr. 3-5 ELA proficiency, according to FSA. Overall, our lowest 25% increased dramatically from 53% to 66% in ELA and from 39% to 69% in Mathematics from FY 17-18 to FY 18-19. Additionally, our subgroup data shows that our Students with Disabilities (SWD), Hispanic, and Black students are not making adequate progress or gains in reading and math compared to other years or other subgroups. In order to align with the District's plan and to ensure progress towards achievement in reading we need to increase in these areas through the use of small group.
Measurable Outcome:	increase ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 by 10% from 39% to 49%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	JoAnne Rogers (joanne.rogers@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of high yielding strategy of small groups, This will Guide student practice by asking questions and providing feedback. Small group instruction will also allow teachers to check that students understand text Full curriculum alignment to standards (also, instruction, assessment, and resources) - Whole (Explicit), Guided, Small Group Instruction (tailored to needs of each child) - Increased Rigor Scale, Expected Outcomes, Learning Target High Order Questions (Marzano Taxonomy, to knowledge utilization from retrieval) Question Stems Contextual Evidence and Proof Academic Language and Conversations Vocabulary in Context (spiraled throughout the year in the modules) Regular practice, high text complexity Whole Literacy combined with performance based approaches - Expanding Students Overall Schema & Background Knowledge Field Trips (transferring and applying knowledge outside of the classroom) Unit Integration of STEM components Special Clubs (Ballet, SECME, Leadership, Drumline, Art, Future Teachers, etc) Technology Integration (SMART Panels,too all teachers, 1:1 iPad Rollout, Chromebooks)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group provides intensive instruction on specific skills on a daily basis that promotes the development of the various components of reading proficiency to students who show minimal progress after reasonable time in tier 2 small group instruction (tier 3). Assuring Curriculum Alignment When regularly exposed to standards-based instruction, assessment, and resources, students are better equipped to achieve proficiency and gains. - Whole Group, Guided, Small Group Instruction When instruction goes beyond teacher-explicit delivery to include small group, instruction is then tailored to the individual need of students, for a personal approach to learning. - Increased Rigor

When students are exposed to high-yielding strategies through both explicit and small group instruction, students' capacity to apply critical thinking and problem-solving is increased.
- Expanded Student Schema and Background Knowledge
Students are better able to connect to text and concepts when knowledge of vocabulary,

Action Steps to Implement

1. Academic Tutors to provide a double-down model for K-5 classrooms Schedules are maximized to ensure double-down model is implemented across all grade levels. Collaborative planning with tutors
2. General education teacher collaboration with ELL/ESE teachers for delivery
of standards-based instruction, rigorous strategies, and appropriately used
resources. PLC focuses on identifying the standard, a variety of instructional
strategies to be implemented (the how) based on monitored data, and
effective resources.
3. Extended Learning Opportunities
-After school (Primary: focus on phonics instruction and word study)
4. Deliberate implementation of real-word, hands-on, field experiences to
enhance learning (richer units) Professional Development opportunities and support are provided to develop
units using interdisciplinary strategies, inquiry-based learning, STEM infusion, and Marzano Taxonomy.
5. Expand teacher capacity:
- PLC collaboration
- Learning walks
- Modeling and Coaching by SSCC, Resource Teachers, Stem Coach, IB
Coordinator
- CWTs with specific, meaningful feedback by the administration

Person Responsible   JoAnne Rogers (joanne.rogers@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:
The History of the Holocaust
Grove Park has Holocaust survivors speak to our students. This year our students were able to hear and perform songs and skits to the student body through their classes as they learned about the varied cultures. Getting to know the history, culture, foods.
The History of Black and African Americans
The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics
The Contributions of Women
The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. Our SWPBS Team conducted a behavior matrix and posted expectation posters throughout the school, as well as kid friendly videos. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statute 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. We also have parent/family multicultural nights.
Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures through in class learning and through the various clubs offered at our school.
We instill citizenship through our Safety Patrols, and our student school ambassadors this group consist of only 5th grade students who are responsible, respectful, and set a good example for the students at ETES. Their main job is to maintain the safety of our students.

Grove Park implements multiple measures of analyzing school-wide data that drives the RTI process. Student assessments include but are not limited to FLCKERS, Diagnostics, Performance Matters Assessments, Florida Standards Assessments, iReady district diagnostics, and RRR. The annual test administered for ELL students is ACCESS. In addition, the WIDA is used to assess ELL students' proficiency in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Teachers are trained by instructional coaches to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction based on the results of data.

Single school culture (Academics, Behavior, Climate)
Academics:
Collaborative Planning Communities (PLCs) occur every week per grade level. Grade level teachers meet with the SSCC, academic coaches and administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and create standards based learning goal scales. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed. Grade levels meet for Common Planning. Teams create goals and plans based on standards, domains, units of study, and big ideas. It is then determined how all subject areas can be incorporated into the subject being taught.
Behavior: CHAMPS school wide, universal attention signal
Grove Park is implementing a School-wide Positive Behavior System. CHAMPS is being implemented by all staff members in all areas of the school.

Climate: Universal Behavioral Matrix

District resources allocated to our school:
Regional support teams
Curriculum support
Reading Interventionist
Single School Culture Coordinator

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.

In an effort to build cultural relationships between teachers and students and all of our stakeholders, we stress the school and the district's statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and align with our school's School improvement strategies. Our school will embrace the varied cultures on the campus and within the community. Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 10003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8) (b), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:
• History of Holocaust
• History of Africans and African Americans
• Hispanic Contributions
• Women's Contributions
• Sacrifices of Veterans
• Florida History
• 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.
• Health Education
• Hosting a multicultural event that will showcase the diverse cultures of students within our school to unite and develop single school culture.
• Provide professional development to staff on increasing positive interactions with students.
• Attend District provided Professional Development on multicultural offerings.
• Embed cultural activities within the curriculum and daily course work (e.g., reading selections, writing prompts).
• Assure all teachers will participate in the process of discussing climate guidelines
• Identify and engage school community stakeholders (e.g. parents, students, teachers, school counselors, etc.) in assessing the current state of the cultural awareness and student-teacher relationships (data-based decision making). Identify on-campus "relationship experts" to implement evidence-based strategies to develop cultural awareness, and cultural responsiveness to improve student-teacher relations, and close existing social justice/equity gaps

• Engage in collaborative efforts between community agencies and our school to infuse a mentoring program that will identify ways to support the students based on their individual academic, social, and emotional needs. This, in turn, will create a more supportive school environment that will meet the needs of all students and our stakeholders.

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: Small Group Instruction				$197,313.25
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	1411 - Grove Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$135,065.15
	5900	160-Other Support Personnel	1411 - Grove Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$62,248.10
					Total:	$197,313.25