

Martin County School District

Palm City Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Palm City Elementary School

1951 SW 34TH ST, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/pces

Demographics

Principal: Lauren Rabener

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 22% |
| 2018-19 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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (76%) |
| 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 Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Palm City Elementary School

1951 SW 34TH ST, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/pces

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | No | 25% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 20% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Palm City Elementary School shares that of the Martin County School District: Educate all students for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Palm City Elementary School shares that of the Martin County School District: A dynamic educational system of excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Monte, Robyn | Principal | |
| Rabener, Lauren | Assistant Principal | |
| Conley, Tara | Instructional Coach | |
| Lindsey, Tara | Instructional Media | |
| Harrington, Kerriann | Teacher, ESE | |
| Poirier, Clea | Psychologist | |
| Miles, Carolyn | School Counselor | |
| Atkinson, Elizabeth | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Moore, Amanda | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Milidantri, Judith | Teacher, K-12 | School Advisory Council Chair |
| Schoemer, Christen | Teacher, K-12 | |
| White, Kathryn | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Nissinoff, Wyndi | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Stewart, Sierra | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Diapoules, Rita | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Carbaugh, Lisa | Teacher, K-12 | School Advisory Council Chair |

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 | 74 | 83 | 93 | 93 | 106 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 565 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

38

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/4/2019

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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 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 | 77% | 58% | 57% | 72% | 59% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 70% | 59% | 58% | 70% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 54% | 56% | 53% | 52% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 80% | 65% | 63% | 76% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 71% | 65% | 62% | 78% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | 53% | 51% | 59% | 55% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 65% | 58% | 53% | 73% | 55% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 74 (0) | 83 (0) | 93 (0) | 93 (0) | 106 (0) | 116 (0) | 565 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 (11) | 4 (7) | 9 (3) | 4 (6) | 4 (6) | 6 (14) | 36 (47) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (2) | 0 (0) | 0 (3) | 0 (5) | 0 (13) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 (0) | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (1) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (15) | 4 (13) | 13 (19) | 18 (47) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 83% | 54% | 29% | 58% | 25% |
| | 2018 | 75% | 57% | 18% | 57% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 81% | 57% | 24% | 58% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 65% | 55% | 10% | 56% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 68% | 55% | 13% | 56% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 74% | 58% | 16% | 55% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 85% | 58% | 27% | 62% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 63% | 19% | 62% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 80% | 67% | 13% | 64% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 77% | 64% | 13% | 62% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 74% | 64% | 10% | 60% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 64% | 9% | 61% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 64% | 53% | 11% | 53% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 54% | 13% | 55% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 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 | 79 | 74 | 50 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 58 | | | | |

| 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 |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 68 | 69 | 70 | 84 | 73 | | 54 | | | | |
| MUL | 67 | | | 83 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 70 | 53 | 80 | 69 | 49 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 61 | 50 | 64 | 70 | 52 | 40 | | | | |
| 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 | 60 | 60 | | 64 | 58 | 31 | 36 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | | | 58 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 68 | 63 | 47 | 82 | 63 | 30 | 76 | | | | |
| MUL | 83 | | | 92 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 64 | 59 | 78 | 64 | 41 | 66 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 54 | 56 | 60 | 53 | 23 | 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 | 59 | 59 | | 59 | 70 | 55 | | | | | |
| ASN | 90 | | | 90 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 71 | | 68 | 69 | 46 | 59 | | | | |
| MUL | 82 | | | 82 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | 69 | 51 | 78 | 79 | 63 | 74 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 52 | 40 | 52 | 67 | 46 | 50 | | | | |

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 | 68 |
| 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 | 73 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 542 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 69 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 73 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 70 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 75 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |

| White Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 67 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 56 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

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.

Learning Gains of the students who make up the Lowest Quartile in both math and ELA show the lowest performance. Palm City Elementary has struggled in this area, however, in math made a 13 percentage point increase from 39% of the lowest quartile making gains in 2017-2018 to 52% during the 2018-2019, school year. Through data analysis, problem-solving, and the MTSS process the school will continue to work to increase the number of students in the lowest quartile in both math and ELA making learning gains.

Learning Gains of the students in the Lowest Quartile in ELA decreased by 4 percentage points.

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

The greatest decline was in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile in the 2018-2019, school year which showed a decrease of 4 percentage points. Contributing factors could be but are not limited to; inconsistent ELA curriculum for the 4th and 5th graders in this group, lack of professional development prior to 2017, when these students were in 2nd and 3rd grade, and for some, inconsistencies at home. The fourth grade students who make up this component were all being worked with in some capacity; be it tiered interventions, ESE services and interventions, or Social Emotional/Behavioral interventions or counseling. The fifth grade students who make up this component with the exception of approximately three students all had major office discipline referrals at least once and many minor referrals throughout the year.

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.

Palm City Elementary exceeds the state's average in all areas. The area the school exceeded the state showing the largest positive gap was ELA Achievement with a 20 percentage point difference where the school average was 77% and the state, 57%, followed by Math Achievement with a 17 percentage point difference where the school average was 80% and the state's was 63%. Consistent curriculum, coaching, modeling, and implementation are key factors to this success. Teachers work collaboratively with their teams to plan using curriculum provided and in ELA, work closely with the instructional coach to plan and implement lessons.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the largest gains with a 13 percentage point difference. While this is still an area that the school needs to work on, moving from 39% to 52% shows promise. The school utilized the Collaborative Learning Teams to analyze data and differentiate instruction. If needed, the school used the MTSS process to design tiered interventions. While this may seem like a typical action to take, in past years it was difficult to implement due to the amount of students demonstrating a need for reading interventions. The impact of a stronger core resulted in having fewer students in need of intensive or supplemental reading instruction at the higher grade levels allowed for teachers to spend more time with the students in this component and put interventions in place if needed.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Palm City Elementary boasted one of the highest attendance rates in the district during the 2018-2019 school year when compared to other elementary schools in the district. Students reporting in this area decreased from by 10 students for the 2019-2020 school year. The largest area of concern related to the EWS data is the number of students in grades 4 and 5 during the 2018-2019, school year that scored a level 1 on FSA. This number decreased from the 2017-2018 school year by 7 students.

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

1. Increase learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA
2. Continue to increase learning gains of the lowest quartile in Math
3. Increase Science achievement
4. Increase learning gains in ELA and Math
5. Increase proficiency in ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Increase Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile in ELA |
| Rationale | Based on FSA data review from the 2018-2019, school year this area showed the greatest decline, 4 percentage points. This area of learning impacts some of the school's most critical learners who need |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile in ELA from by 3 percentage points, 54% to 57%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Lauren Rabener (rabanel@martinschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | During Collaborative Learning Teams, use data to identify areas of need, determine how to reduce the problem using the Problem Solving Protocol, implementing instructional strategies to support the specific students demonstrating the problem, utilizing formative assessment to measure the degree to which the problem was reduced, and meeting together as a team to determine outcomes and next steps. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Collaborative Learning Teams have been in place for several years in the school and are proven to increase outcomes for school achievement. Utilizing the Guiding Questions, "What do we want students to learn?, How will we know if they have learned? What will we do if they don't learn? and What will we do if they already know it?" teams can be sure they are differentiating to meet the needs of all learners. Dr. George M. Batsche suggests that similar problem solving can be done using a Problem-Solving Protocol and data evaluation to determine rates of growth and research-based instructional practices to meet student needs across all tiers. Data evaluation is done prior to problem-solving through the MTSS process which will be use if students are still struggling to learn despite attempts to problem-solve using data analysis during CLTs. Part of this process involves using the ICEL by RIOT matrix. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Universal Screener 2. CLT meets to determine area of need by grade level 3. CLT develops plan using Problem-Solving Protocol and ICEL by RIOT Matrix 4. Formative assessments given to measure student growth in area of need 5. CLT meets to determine outcomes and next steps- repeat cycle |
| Person Responsible | Lauren Rabener (rabanel@martinschools.org) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Increase Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile in Math |
| Rationale | Based on FSA data review from the 2018-2019, school year this area showed the greatest increase, 13 percentage points, however is still one of the school's lowest areas overall (52%). |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase learning gains of the lowest quartile in math by 3 percentage points, 52% to 55%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Lauren Rabener (rabanel@martinschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <p>During Collaborative Learning Teams, use data to identify areas of need, determine how to reduce the problem using the Problem Solving Protocol, implementing instructional strategies to support the specific students demonstrating the problem, utilizing formative assessment to measure the degree to which the problem was reduced, and meeting together as a team to determine outcomes and next steps.</p> <p>Collaborative Learning Teams have been in place for several years in the school and are proven to increase outcomes for school achievement. Utilizing the Guiding Questions, "What do we want students to learn?, How will we know if they have learned? What will we do if they don't learn? and What will we do if they already know it?" teams can be sure they are differentiating to meet the needs of all learners. Dr. George M. Batsche suggests that similar problem solving can be done using a Problem-Solving Protocol and data evaluation to determine rates of growth and research-based instructional practices to meet student needs across all tiers. Data evaluation is done prior to problem-solving through the MTSS process which will be use if students are still struggling to learn despite attempts to problem-solve using data analysis during CLTs. Part of this process involves using the ICEL by RIOT matrix.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Universal Screener 2. CLT meets to determine area of need by grade level 3. CLT develops plan using Problem-Solving Protocol and ICEL by RIOT Matrix 4. Formative assessments given to measure student growth in area of need 5. CLT meets to determine outcomes and next steps-repeat cycle |
| Person Responsible | Lauren Rabener (rabanel@martinschools.org) |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Increase Grade 5 Science Achievement |
| Rationale | <p>Recently, the school has seen a declining trend with Science Achievement for Grade 5. The achievement level decreased from 67% to 65% in the last school year. Last year a plan was implemented to make science a focus for grades 3-5, not only in classrooms but for related arts, as well. The team worked together collaboratively with the science lab teacher, media specialist, and computer lab assistant. All three created lessons that would work together to help students process and use the information being learned. Furthermore, the classroom teachers co-taught laboratories with the science teacher. Ultimately, this did not have a positive impact on the school's outcomes related to science.</p> |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase from 65% to 68%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Lauren Rabener (rabanel@martinschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <p>During Collaborative Learning Teams, use data to identify areas of need, determine how to reduce the problem using the Problem Solving Protocol, implementing instructional strategies to support the specific students demonstrating the problem, utilizing formative assessment to measure the degree to which the problem was reduced, and meeting together as a team to determine outcomes and next steps. This will be a goal specific to grades 3-5, since these grade levels have progress monitoring tests.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <p>This year the district as purchased Performance Matters which will provide immediate feedback to teachers and students on grade level science standards. The grade level can compare other schools' performance on the standards and reach out to find out what strategies and experiments were done. Using the CLT process to determine if the teaching is reducing the problem in the area of science will help to increase the overall achievement level for Grade 5 science in the years to come. Research also supports that students need to participate in hands-on experiments and have an opportunity to expand their thinking through writing. This year the school has created an extra science lab for teachers to use for common grade level experiments or any others that they should choose. The laboratory is stocked and organized so that teachers can walk in and do an experiment with their class.</p> |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Progress Monitoring Tests 2. CLT meets to determine area of need by grade level 3. CLT develops plan using Problem-Solving Protocol and ICEL by RIOT Matrix 4. Formative assessments given to measure student growth in area of need 5. CLT meets to determine outcomes and next steps-repeat cycle |
| Person Responsible | Lauren Rabener (rabanel@martinschools.org) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Parental involvement is exceptionally high as indicated by the "5 Star Award" that the school has received for 15 years, however, the relationships go far beyond current parents and truly include all stakeholders, past and present. The community is incredibly supportive of the school and has been for the past 60 years. Business partners and volunteers work collaboratively with the school and PTA to support needs, be it financially or human resource based. Communication is the vehicle for building positive relationships with all stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission to 'Educate ALL Students for Success.' "The Wildcat Chat Newsletter" is emailed weekly to parents, PCE's School App is available, along with Blackboard Connect calls. Classroom teachers communicate with parents regularly through various modalities. This year Palm City Elementary started a Facebook Page and currently has 440 followers. The benefit to this social media outlet is the ability to share what the school does on a daily basis that stakeholders may not know about. Spirit Days are a prime example of something that stakeholders are aware of, but unsure of what the students do. Facebook has helped to breakdown that barrier.

The positive long-lasting relationships that the school has cultivated overtime have to do with the lasting memories made here. Grandparents bring their children to the school for events, reminiscing over bringing their own children here, and in some cases, attending the school personally. The events that make up some of these memories are the work of community, which include Fall Fest, Book Fair, All-Pro Dads, Parent-Child Dances, parades, and Junior Achievement to name a few. Yet another reason for these positive relationships are the teachers who tend to stay at the school for the majority of their careers, thus strengthening the memories, connections, and relationships.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

PBIS, Conscious Discipline, Growth Mindset, Character Counts!, Restorative Practices, and Sanford Harmony make up what PCE calls it's PAWS Team. Through all of these programs, the school has created a system for cultivating acceptance and social-emotional learning. The team meets once a month to work on school-wide initiatives. Last year the team worked to revise the matrix and change the commitments to Polite, Aware, Wise, and Safe. The team also collects data from every teacher by office discipline referral data and the Behavior Identification Survey which helps teachers reflect on externalizing and internalizing behaviors that could affect a students' social-emotional needs. Should a child require intervention, the team follows the MTSS process. The school counselor leads the work of the PAWS Team and if needed, shares information with the School Social Service Worker. A Tykes and Teens counselor is also assigned to the school.

Each classroom, including related arts teachers, are trained in Restorative Practices and conduct a Getting to Know You or Community Building circle each week. Sanford Harmony materials are also provided to each teacher and the school counselor is using lessons with each grade level. All teachers are committed to Conscious Discipline and start the day with a greeting at the door. Brain Smart Starts and Morning Meetings are also an expectation at PCE. If a student has disciplinary needs, through a minor or major referral, the school looks for the missing skills and puts supports in place to re-teach the skill and identify replacement behaviors.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The entire community works together to ensure smooth transitions when supporting incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to the next.

The school provides campus tours to local preschools, kindergarten screenings, and hosts a Meet the Teacher event prior to the first day of school. PCE is home to two VPK classrooms and a Pre-K ESE unit that are included in the major functions of the school. Students transitioning to our Gifted Unit are invited to participate in school tour.

Fifth grade students with an IEP, EP, or 504 plan receive transition meetings with their feeder middle school to provide support and services at the middle school level. All fifth grade students participate in "Middle School Shuffle" to emulate a day in middle school, which helps support a smooth transition. Finally, the School Social Service Worker works at the middle school and supports all feeding elementary schools.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The leadership team will dis-aggregate school and student data and provide teachers with information identifying students who are underachieving according to grade level benchmarks in mathematics, literacy, and in 5th grade, science. The team will also meet with teachers to review data, use the ICEL & RIOT method for problem-solving to reduce problems, design interventions for those students where the problem is not reduced in core by implementing supplemental and/or intensive interventions. The fidelity of core instruction as well as interventions will be monitored by administration through Collaborative Learning Teams, lesson plans, intervention logs and classroom observations. SIP goals and strategies will be created based on school, student, and staff needs, as identified through data collected through student assessment and school-wide learning walks. Resources will be allocated to support SIP goals and strategies. SIP committees will be formed to monitor the implementation and progress of the SIP plan. Collaborative Learning Teams meet weekly, which allows for teachers to move through the four step cycle and make data-based decisions about instruction. If teachers have concerns about individual student achievement, they meet with the MTSS team to discuss the academic and behavioral concerns of their students.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) will be formed to monitor the implementation and progress of the SIP plan. Members of the leadership team will also serve on the SAC.

The leadership team serves as the facilitator and offers strategies and support to improve student outcomes. Furthermore, the leadership team supports teachers in promoting academic excellence through Professional Learning Communities, Collaborative Learning Teams, Data Team Meetings, modeling, and Professional Development.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Junior Achievement is done in every classroom at every grade level with a culminating event for fifth grade students, Biz Town. Community partners such as SeaCoast Bank allow students opportunities to bank weekly. Two local judges support our students by presenting to fifth grade on the United States Constitution each year. The school also participates in iC3 Spark Testing for digital citizenship and certification. New to kindergarten this year is the PLAYS Project funded by the Education Foundation of Martin County, which is a half hour every day where students are introduced to a new topic (restaurant, veterinary, ice cream shop, day care) learn about the available roles they can play, important vocabulary around the topic, and how to use some toys provided. Students then spend the week playing around the topic with the support of the teacher to lift their language as they play and help problem-solve and self-regulate when a problem is encountered.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---|---|--------------------------|-----|--------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile in ELA | | | | \$8,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 3610 | 510-Supplies | 0061 - Palm City Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$8,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Funds will support classroom libraries books across many genres within and beyond the grade level complexity bands that are vivid and engaging and from a variety of publishers. These funds will also continue to build the resources in the school's book room which is used for small group differentiated instruction. | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile in Math | | | | \$4,500.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 3610 | 510-Supplies | 0061 - Palm City Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$4,500.00 |
| | | | Notes: Professional development and professional resources are needed to support teachers as they support students with their learning in math. The media specialist (who has a strong math background) is working with students in grades 3-5 who scored a level 1 or 2 and/or may be in the probable lowest quartile this school year. Materials will be needed to support that work. Professional development will need to be provided to teachers in grades KG-5. | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase Grade 5 Science Achievement | | | | \$2,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 3610 | 510-Supplies | 0061 - Palm City Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Teams created lists of materials needed for common laboratories and any other laboratory experiments being conducted this year. | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$14,500.00 |