

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Lantana Middle School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>23</b> |

# Lantana Middle School

1225 W DREW ST, Lantana, FL 33462

<https://lanm.palmbeachschools.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Edward Burke**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2008

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Native American Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (55%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)<br>2016-17: C (50%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |

\* 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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>23</b> |

## Lantana Middle School

1225 W DREW ST, Lantana, FL 33462

<https://lanm.palmbeachschools.org>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 94%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 91%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | B       | B       | B       |

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

##### Lantana Community Middle School Mission Statement

The mission of Lantana Middle Community School is to promote academic excellence, encourage an appreciation of our multi-cultural society and respect for others, develop lifelong learning skills, facilitate increased technological literacy, cultivate school and community partnerships, and foster growth among faculty and administrators in a positive, safe environment;

In order to achieve our mission, the school will become a learning center where:

1. Students will demonstrate mastery of basic skills taught by teachers using the Florida state standards.
2. Staff and students will encourage and demonstrate problem solving and critical thinking skills.
3. Staff and students will have access to and become proficient in using technology.
4. Administration will offer classes on a wide variety of levels to meet the needs of all students.
5. Staff will participate in a wide variety of professional growth opportunities to help meet the needs of our changing population.
6. Staff will encourage community involvement to develop community and school partnerships.

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

##### Lantana Middle School Vision Statement

Lantana Middle School subscribes to the vision of the School District of Palm Beach County, of 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             | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Burke, Edward    | Principal           | Provide leadership, direction and co-ordination within the school. The Principal's main focus is to develop and maintain effective educational programs and to promote the improvement of teaching and learning within Lantana Community Middle School |
| Nelson, Willie   | Assistant Principal | Serve as an instructional leader responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, supervision, operations, and accountability at Lantana Middle School.  |
| Vazquez, David   | Assistant Principal | Serve as an instructional leader responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, supervision, operations, and accountability at Lantana Middle School.  |
| Simmonds, Janina | Assistant Principal | Serve as an instructional leader responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, supervision, operations, and accountability at Lantana Middle School.  |
| Peterson, Jordan | Other               | Develops and disseminates information pertinent to SSC to assure compliance with goals, objectives, and activities and budget  |
| Davis, Nicole    | Instructional Coach | Assists teachers through PLCs and lesson planning in effectively using data to make adjustments to instruction.  |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 7/7/2008, Edward Burke

**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.*

3

**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.*

32

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

67

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

761

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

5



Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

## Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

#### 2021-22

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                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 274 | 251 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 761 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58  | 20  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101 |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17  | 17  | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 107 | 105 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 213 |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 119 | 92  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 212 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83  | 83  | 70  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 236 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64  | 73  | 87  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 224 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80  | 84  | 84  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 248 |       |
| FY21 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2                         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 209 | 210 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 595 |       |
| FY21 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2                        | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 219 | 201 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 587 |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 110 | 102 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 335 |       |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

#### 2020-21 - 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 | 272 | 287 | 261 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 820 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61  | 39  | 54  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 154 |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12  | 48  | 46  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 106 |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 51  | 33  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 209 |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55  | 98  | 30  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 183 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83  | 83  | 70  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 236 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64  | 73  | 87  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 224 |       |
| FY20 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2          | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 142 | 151 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 463 |       |
| FY20 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 144 | 126 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 408 |       |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 111 | 96 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 321 |       |

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

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

**2020-21 - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272 | 287 | 261 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 820 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61  | 39  | 54  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 154 |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12  | 48  | 46  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 106 |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 51  | 33  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 209 |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55  | 98  | 30  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 183 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83  | 83  | 70  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 236 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64  | 73  | 87  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 224 |       |
| FY20 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2          | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 142 | 151 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 463 |       |
| FY20 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 144 | 126 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 408 |       |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 111 | 96 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 321   |

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

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

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      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 46%    | 58%      | 54%   | 45%    | 56%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 59%    | 56%      | 54%   | 55%    | 57%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 53%    | 49%      | 47%   | 49%    | 49%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 47%    | 62%      | 58%   | 47%    | 61%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 50%    | 60%      | 57%   | 54%    | 61%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 46%    | 53%      | 51%   | 55%    | 54%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 44%    | 52%      | 51%   | 41%    | 55%      | 52%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 68%    | 75%      | 72%   | 62%    | 75%      | 72%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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 |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 58%      | -17%                       | 54%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 45%    | 53%      | -8%                        | 52%   | -7%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -41%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 46%    | 58%      | -12%                       | 56%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -45%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 35%    | 60%      | -25%                       | 55%   | -20%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 14%    | 35%      | -21%                       | 54%   | -40%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -35%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 56%    | 64%      | -8%                        | 46%   | 10%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -14%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 51%      | -10%                       | 48%   | -7%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 65%    | 72%      | -7%                   | 71%   | -6%                |
| HISTORY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 76%    | 64%      | 12%                   | 61%   | 15%                |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 94%    | 60%      | 34%                   | 57%   | 37%                |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

Based on the following FY'21 FSA and EOC scores...

FY' 21 Winter Diagnostic vs FSA'21 results show"

ELA Proficient: Winter Diagnostics (29%) and FSA '21 (36%)

Math Proficient: Winter Diagnostics (23 %) and FSA'21 (14%)

Science Proficiency: Winter Diagnostics (45 %)and FSA'21 (34%) , ranking #2 amongst PBCSD Title I Schools

Civics Proficiency: Winter Diagnostics (31%) and FSA'21 (51 %) , ranking #2 amongst PBCSD Title I Schools

Algebra I EOC FY'21: 49% Proficient

Geometry EOC FY'21: 73% Proficient

LCMS leadership will continue to closely monitor student progression FY'22 in order utilizing data from district assessments (FSQs, USAs, & NGSQs), Reading Plus reports, Imagine Learning, System 44, and district diagnostics for progress monitoring. The data these formal assessments will be used in PLC meetings and data chats to drive instruction in the classroom and plan for remediation of standards.

| Grade 6               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 40   | 28.6   | 34.7   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 40.3 | 27.1   | 33.8   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 17.3 | 12.5   | 21.6   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 16.7 | 9.6    | 9.2    |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 48.6 | 21.7   | 18.1   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 48.9 | 20.6   | 17.7   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 28.6 | 7.0    | 5.7    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 35.2 | 9.5    | 6.9    |

| Grade 7               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 32.3 | 20.4   | 30.7   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 33.5 | 20.0   | 31.8   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 20.8 | 10.7   | 16.7   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 12.3 | 6.5    | 9.0    |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 32.8 | 12.4   | 6.9    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 32.4 | 12.2   | 7.2    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 22.9 | 10.3   | 12.9   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 20.0 | 11.7   | 2.0    |
| Civics                | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | n/a  | 43.7   | 51.4   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a  | 44.0   | 51.2   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | n/a  | 31.6   | 45.1   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | n/a  | 29.5   | 31.1   |

| Grade 8                  |                               |      |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 42.0 | 38.6   | 43.3   |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 42.1 | 37.3   | 40.0   |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 13.5 | 10.9   | 12.1   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 12.1 | 17.9   | 12.2   |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 23   | 35.5   | 15.9   |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 27.7 | 34.8   | 16.0   |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 13.5 | 31.7   | 10.4   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 12.1 | 34.7   | 13.8   |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science                  | All Students                  | n/a  | 37.9   | 33.6   |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | n/a  | 36.1   | 30.7   |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | n/a  | 10.2   | 8.6    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | n/a  | 17.5   | 10.9   |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 21          | 32        | 18                | 13           | 19         | 23                 | 18          | 43         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 29          | 37        | 31                | 17           | 17         | 25                 | 15          | 43         | 54           |                         |                           |
| ASN                                       |             | 80        |                   |              | 20         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 39          | 42        | 35                | 21           | 20         | 28                 | 39          | 58         | 49           |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 34          | 39        | 25                | 20           | 16         | 16                 | 27          | 46         | 54           |                         |                           |
| MUL                                       | 18          | 36        |                   | 18           | 18         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT                                       | 45          | 47        |                   | 28           | 23         |                    | 67          | 44         | 54           |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 36          | 41        | 29                | 20           | 18         | 22                 | 32          | 51         | 53           |                         |                           |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 28          | 53        | 47                | 28           | 44         | 37                 | 36          | 49         | 53           |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 28          | 56        | 58                | 34           | 46         | 47                 | 16          | 55         | 65           |                         |                           |

| 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 |
| AMI                                       | 29       | 54     |             | 29        | 38      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 47       | 59     | 49          | 44        | 49      | 49           | 40       | 69      | 85        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 41       | 56     | 57          | 46        | 48      | 46           | 44       | 65      | 78        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 68       | 71     |             | 57        | 55      |              |          | 70      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 64       | 66     | 63          | 58        | 60      | 56           | 60       | 70      | 73        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 58     | 53          | 45        | 48      | 46           | 42       | 66      | 79        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 23       | 46     | 47          | 29        | 45      | 40           | 17       | 38      | 90        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 17       | 46     | 48          | 25        | 46      | 55           |          | 41      |           |                   |                     |
| AMI                                       | 13       | 38     |             | 33        | 47      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 42       | 54     | 56          | 44        | 50      | 53           | 43       | 68      | 87        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 44       | 54     | 43          | 45        | 54      | 57           | 37       | 55      | 85        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 65       | 60     |             | 70        | 60      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 55       | 57     | 53          | 62        | 62      | 58           | 48       | 70      | 96        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 43       | 54     | 49          | 46        | 53      | 55           | 40       | 60      | 88        |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 35  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 6   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 39  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 347 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 88% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 23  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |     |



| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 31  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| 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   | 50  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 37  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 32  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 23  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | YES |
| 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   | 44  |
| 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                                | 34  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

FY' 21 Winter Diagnostic vs FSA'21 results show"

ELA Proficient: Winter Diagnostics (29%) and FSA '21 (36%)

Math Proficient: Winter Diagnostics (23 %) and FSA'21 (14%)

Science Proficiency: Winter Diagnostics (45 %)and FSA'21 (34%) , ranking #2 amongst PBCSD Title I Schools

Civics Proficiency: Winter Diagnostics (31%) and FSA'21 (51 %) , ranking #2 amongst PBCSD Title I Schools

Algebra I EOC FY'21: 49% Proficient

Geometry EOC FY'21: 73% Proficient

Within the year, we see a trend of proficiency that has dropped well below previous FY'19 scores and the District average in all tested areas.

Based on 2019 FSA data, In tested areas (ELA, Math, Science, a& Clvics, the percentage of Lantana Community Middle School proficient students scored below the district average by at least 5 percentage points. Based on 2019 FSA data, Algebra I and Math EOCS, Consistently, SWD & AMI students have scored lower proficiency in ELA & Math Achievement. The percentage of White students scoring proficient is higher than other subgroups. A

Based on data, our focus will be to increase the decrease the amount of students who are failing courses . We will utilized remediation of standards and data driven instruction that focuses on rigorous standards in all content areas. We will specifically focus on our ESSA identified subgroup: AMI, who will be targeted through instruction, tutorials, and monitoring.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

There is increased number of Level I students on the statewide assessment. Our focus is to increase the percentage of students who are proficient in both ELA and Math. Reading Plus is a schoolwide initiative to occur in Intensive Reading classrooms with our Level 1 and 2 students, as well as in our Advanced ELA classes with our Level 3 - 5 students. Targeted support is provided for struggling learners with a focus on our ELL and SWD students. Academic tutors will assist teachers with small group instruction for more streamlined skill based lessons. Progress monitoring and data chats will occur frequently with students and teachers in the classroom. Leadership will consistently utilize walkthroughs, observation, meetings, and data chatas to analyze student data provide immediate feedback to instructional staff.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

Many of our students were already not proficient and during the pandemic, many of the students did not participate regularly in content classes which resulted in many course failures and and course retakes over the summer. We have academic loss to make up for during the FY'22 academic year.

We have hired an ELA resource teacher to level the ELA class numbers and to provide push in support for our teachers. We have advertised for an additional Reading teacher and a PLC resource teacher to support teachers in the classroom and plan for data driven instruction. We will utilize funds to provide intensive tutoring afterschool and on Saturdays for our students in all tested areas to increase the number of students that are proficient.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The trends emerging are that many of the students have deficiencies in both Reading and Math. There were actually no improvements when compared to 2019 state assessments. Each of the tested areas lost percentage points in each cell which was aligned to district scores.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Facilitate collaborative planning time for ESE and general education teachers. Create a masterboard where content area grade specific teachers have the same planning to facilitate PLCs.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

In order to accelerate learning, students enrolled in Algebra I and Geometry will need intensive tutoring, as well as Bootcamps. This intensive instruction will target the standards and teach test taking skills needed to make up the loss and improve students' EOC performance.

LCMS has hired a Math resource teacher and double blocked a new teacher's Algebra I class in order to provide instructional support for student success. Teachers who teach Algebra I will consistently meet with the Math Coach and resource teacher in PLCs to increase collaboration and consistency instructionally.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional development is key to ensure all staff will understand the delivery and execution of all strategies. Staff will participate in collaborative training for:

SwPBS

Single School Culture

Standards Based Instruction

Technology

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Biweekly SBT/RTI meetings, quarterly data chats with ELA and Math departments, tutoring after school, Saturday Bootcamp tutorials, and use of SEL lessons by the Behavior Health Professional and the Case Manager.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:****#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Data from the Winter FSA FY'21 reveals only 36 % of the LCMS students are performing proficiently in ELA, which is 10 percentage points lower than the FSA FY'19 results.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Increase achievement levels of students in ELA to 50% of the students achieving proficiency in ELA,   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | PLC Notes, Data Chats, Performance Matters Data, and Observation and Feedback.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Edward Burke (edward.burke@palmbeachschools.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Level 1 and 2 students are scheduled in Intensive Reading classes homogenously<br>All students Level 3 - 5 students are scheduled in Advanced or Cambridge ELA classes.<br>Reading Plus is implemented school wide.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Allows teachers to plan for more targeted instruction, focusing on specific skills for students.<br>Supports students and provides the opportunity for more rigorous instruction.<br>Provides scaffolded reading practice to improve students' silent reading fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Hire Academic Tutors for Push-In and Pull-out Support

\*Employ 3 academic tutors for ELA, MATH, and ALG I Honors to provide small group support.

\*Create a schedule for tutors to provide support teachers that will provide the most return on investment.

Professional Development/Professional Learning Communities

\*Instructional staff engage in 20 hours of PD outside the regular school day.

\*PD/PLCs will focus on data analysis and effective instruction.

\*Work collaboratively in PLCs to plan and develop lessons aligned to the standards.

\*PD will focus on instructional needs and building expertise for using online learning platform.

Tutorials

\*Employ teachers to facilitate instruction for high needs students beyond the regular school day after school and on Saturdays from November through May.

\*Targeted instructional materials will be assembled using Blender resources

\*Tutorials will focus on student needs by content areas.

Instructional Coaching

\*SSC and Math coach will provide support for teachers during PLCs and tutorials

\*Coaches will model, coach, and support teachers facilitating tutorials, provide job-embedded professional development

**Person Responsible** Edward Burke (edward.burke@palmbeachschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**When using Safe Schools for Alex.org LCMS ranks 490 out of 553, which is high compared to all middle schools statewide. 8.4 incidents were reported per 100 students. This rating was for an enrollment of 907 students with 229 suspensions for the 2019-2020 academic year. When looking at the ranking details the incidents rated as very high per student at 6.32 per 100 students. Our issues fall under Fighting, Physical Attack, Sex Offenses, Bullying, Sexual Harassment, Threat/Intimidation, Theft, and Harassment. When looking at the ranking details the incidents rated as high per student at 1.79 per 100 students. Our issues fall under Disruption on campus, Tobacco, Drug Use/Possession, Weapons Possession, and Drug Sales. We had zero incidents for Alcohol and Vandalism.**

**To support our students and make an impact on incidents we will integrate a Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for VIKING PRIDE and communicating these expectations to parents via callouts and parent meetings, and monitoring SWPBS through lessons and resources. Lantana Middle School will provide mentoring to our students to foster positive relationships. We have revised and updated our Behavior Matrix, implemented use of the CBIR, and facilitated small group counseling to decrease the number of out of school suspensions and to provide an alternative solution to address student behavior needs.**

#### **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.**

FCIM is used to apprise each teacher, by subject and grade level of the transitional needs of each class from one grade to the next, at LCMS. The coaches and guidance counselors reach both forward to High schools for our 8th grade students, and backwards for our incoming 6th graders, to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the transitional needs of all these students. Incoming 6th graders are closely monitored by the Guidance team in the FALL to monitor their transition to middle school. The guidance team reach both forward to high schools for our 8th grade students to choose classes and choice opportunities; and they reach back for our incoming 6th graders to ensure that stakeholders are aware of the transitional needs.

At LCMS, we have a variety of Choice Programs. We have Band, Dance, Pre-Teacher, and PreMedical. We are also have the in house Cambridge Academy as a school option. Our Performing Arts Programs, Dance

and Band, are artistic opportunities dedicated to the intensive study of each students' chosen arts major. The programs challenge students to achieve a high standard of artistic professionalism, as well as academic achievement. The PreTeacher Academy is a three year preparatory program that includes topics of study such as child development, nutrition, safety, interpersonal skills, and also offers opportunities to receive certifications in infant/child CPR, First Aid, AED, and baby-sitting. The Pre-Medical Sciences Academy emphasizes science, math, and language skills. All medical courses provide honors credit. The Cambridge Academy provides students with the opportunity to pursue a rigorous program of study based on an internationally standardized curriculum. The goal of the Cambridge program is to build a sound academic foundation for all learners that will enable them to succeed in any high school program including AICE, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Honors and regular education programs. Students will develop skills to be confident, responsible, reflective, innovative and engaged learners. All choice programs supports the development of the characteristics necessary for high school readiness which supports the district's strategic plan.

School-wide Positive Behavior is used to encourage students' academic and behavioral success. To celebrate students "CAUGHT DOING GOOD", students receive rewards and incentives. To the highlight teachers' contributions to students' success, the SWPBS team provides incentives to teachers throughout the year for going above and beyond what is already required of them. Our students are expected to have VIKING P (POSITIVE ATTITUDE). R (RESPONSIBILITY). I (INTEGRITY). D (DEDICATION). AND E (EXCELLENCE).

Suite 360 is the curriculum that the school district selected to implement the 5 hour state mandated instruction related youth mental health and awareness. Throughout the Suite 360 curriculum, students participated in lessons on the following topics: Mental Health Awareness and Assistance, Healthy Coping Skills for Teens, #STOPTHESTIGMA - The Truth about Mental Health Conditions, Supporting Someone with a Mental Health Condition, Prevention of Substance Misuse, Child Trafficking, and Awareness of Resources and the Process of Assessing Treatment.

The School Behavioral Health Professional (SBHP) supports the behavioral and mental health of students. The SBHP position started for the FY'20 academic year as a part of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act to have more mental health professionals in schools and is funded through local referendum dollars. All schools in Palm Beach County have a SBHP.

Resources - 2-1-1 is a community helpline and crisis hotline that provides suicide prevention, crisis intervention, information, assessment, and referral to community services for people of all ages. Caring staff will listen to each individuals situat to provide information on available social services, community services and resources that include food assistance, medical clinics, foreclosure prevention, parenting information on developmental concerns (Help Me Grow) & special needs, senior services that include free "Sunshine" daily calls, services for teens and more. Calls are FREE, CONFIDENTIAL, and available 24/7.

"All aspects of Florida Statute 1103.42 (a-t), Statute 683.1455, Statute 1003.421 and Statute 1008-447118y, and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii) are addressed in our curriculum. With regards to the statutes the curriculum that is taught includes the history of and content of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the history of the United States and the flag, the sacrifices of Veterans, the elements of government, the study of Hispanic contributions and women's contributions to the United States, the history of African Americans including the history of African people, and the history of the Holocaust as the systematic planned annihilation of European Jews and other groups by Nazi Germany."

### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Mr. Edward Burke, Principal, promotes collaboration amongst staff members with proper focus and leadership, creates a positive environment in which teachers can share best practices that are responsible



to student needs.

Mrs. DeCarla Boggs, School Counselor, supports a positive culture and environment through small group and individual interactions and experiences for students. Our school counselor ensures students feel safe, welcome and included.

Ms. Molly, Baer, School Counselor), supports a positive culture and environment through small group and individual interactions and experiences for students. Our school counselor ensures students feel safe, welcome and included.

## Part V: Budget

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

|        |        |   |        |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |   | \$0.00 |