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## South Olive Elementary School

7101 S OLIVE AVE, West Palm Beach, FL 33405
https://soes.palmbeachschools.org

## Principal: Saara Saarela Vening

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| :---: | :---: |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 89\% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented <br> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2018-19: } \mathrm{B}(60 \%) \\ & 2017-18: \mathrm{B}(57 \%) \\ & 2016-17: B(59 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 |  |
| ${ }^{\text {* }}$ As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/20/2021.

## 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\&l:

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 noncharter 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.
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## South Olive Elementary School

7101 S OLIVE AVE, West Palm Beach, FL 33405
https://soes.palmbeachschools.org

## School Demographics

## School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)

Elementary School KG-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

## 2020-21 Title I School

Yes

Charter School

No

2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)

65\%

School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/20/2021.

## 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 noncharter schools with a current grade of $D$ or $F$ (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of $A, B$, or $C$, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

## School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.
South Olive Elementary is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equality to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.
South Olive Elementary envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

## School Leadership Team

## Membership

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

| Name | Position <br> Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | ESOL Coordinator <br> Monitoring ESE initiatives and participates in classroom walk throughs to |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Van | Teacher, |  |
| monitor instruction |  |  |
| Weddingen, |  |  |
| Kerry |  |  |$\quad$| Serves on Leadership team to gather input from her teachers and advise |
| :--- |
| principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students |
| Teacher of ESOL students |

## Kinder Lead

| Murphy, | Teacher, | Facilitates and Monitors PLCs for instruction and data interventions <br> Serves on Leadership team to gather input from her teachers and advise |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lisa | K-12 | principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students |

Name | Position |
| :---: |
| Title |$\quad$ Job Duties and Responsibilities

| Havican, | Teacher |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adam | K-12 |


| Zelnick, | Teacher, | Grade Level Lead, 1st grade. Facilitates PLCs and data chats <br> Serves on Leadership team to gather input from her teachers and advise |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elizabeth | K-12 | principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students |


| Sanabria, | Attendance/ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Behavioral Health Professsional, serves on SAC, McKinney Vento |  |
| Works with families in need to make sure that basic Maslow needs are met |  |
| Daneen | Social Work |
| so that students can be successful with instruction and learning |  |

## Demographic Information

## Principal start date

Sunday 7/5/2015, Saara Saarela Vening
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.
1
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.
9
Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
32
Total number of students enrolled at the school 475

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year. 3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 1

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 | 76 | 70 | 63 | 74 | 81 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 459 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 14 | 27 | 26 | 38 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 7 | 14 | 15 | 30 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| FY21 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 \& 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 41 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| FY21 Math Winter Diag Level 1 \& 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 34 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 8 | 16 | 18 | 28 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/9/2021

## 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 | 62 | 71 | 85 | 80 | 102 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 473 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 12 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 15 | 30 | 24 | 40 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 25 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| FY20 ELA Diag Levels 1 \& 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| FY20 Math Diag Levels 1 \& 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 25 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

## 2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | K | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of students enrolled | 62 | 71 | 85 | 80 | 102 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 473 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 12 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 15 | 30 | 24 | 40 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 25 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| FY20 ELA Diag Levels $1 \& 2$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

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 | 09 | 12 | 16 | 25 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| The number of students identified as retainees: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator | K | 1 | 23 | 4 | Grade Level |  |  |  | $9 \quad 10$ |  | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 2 | 01 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

## 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 |  |  |  | $68 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| ELA Learning Gains |  |  |  | $64 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile |  |  |  | $52 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| Math Achievement |  |  |  | $70 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $62 \%$ |
| Math Learning Gains |  |  |  | $64 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |  |  |  | $52 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Science Achievement |  |  |  | $52 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $55 \%$ |

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 |
| 03 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 66\% | 54\% | 12\% | 58\% | 8\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 72\% | 62\% | 10\% | 58\% | 14\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -66\% |  |  |  |  |
| 05 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 62\% | 59\% | 3\% | 56\% | 6\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -72\% |  |  |  |  |


| MATH |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 74\% | 65\% | 9\% | 62\% | 12\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 62\% | 67\% | -5\% | 64\% | -2\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -74\% |  |  |  |  |
| 05 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 70\% | 65\% | 5\% | 60\% | 10\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -62\% |  |  |  |  |


| SCIENCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- <br> District <br> Comparison | State | School- <br> State <br> Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | $50 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.
-Progress monitoring also allows teachers and administrators to track students' academic progress or growth across the entire school year. Teachers use student performance data to continually evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching and make more informed instructional decisions. If the rate at which a particular student is learning seems insufficient, the teacher can adjust instruction. Various reports will be used to monitor and support student learning: Grades K-5 we will use iReady for Fall, Winter \& Spring

For Math, Grades K-2 will use Successmaker for Fall, Winter, and Spring. Grades $3-5$ will use USAs in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.
-iReady: Provides user-friendly dashboards and clear reports with actionable data that give teachers a foundational understanding of students' strengths and areas of need. -Unit Standardized Assessments USAs gives teachers data on how well the students have mastered the standard. Supports the monitoring of student learning and provides ongoing feedback that instructors can use to make adjustments to instruction to improve student learning.

| Grade 1 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English Language Arts | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 36.5 | 44.6 | 53.8 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 23.8 | 36.4 | 47.7 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 20 | 20 |
|  | English Language Learners | 11.1 | 15.8 | 26.3 |
| Mathematics | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students |  | 74.2 | 83.8 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged |  | 65.1 | 80 |
|  | Students With Disabilities |  | 60 | 60 |
|  | English Language Learners |  | 45 | 65 |
| Grade 2 |  |  |  |  |
| English LanguageArts | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 37.7 | 29.5 | 42.9 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 28.3 | 21.3 | 28.3 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 20 | 20 |
|  | English Language Learners | 10.5 | 0 | 11.1 |
| Mathematics | Number/\% <br> Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students |  | 86.1 | 90.8 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged |  | 85.7 | 90.9 |
|  | Students With Disabilities |  | 71.4 | 75 |
|  | English Language Learners |  | 76.5 | 94.4 |


| Grade 3 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English Language Arts | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 55.7 | 53.1 | 44.4 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 47.2 | 44.4 | 33.3 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 25 | 15 |
|  | English Language Learners | 24 | 19.2 | 7.7 |
| Mathematics | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students |  | 75.6 | 66.7 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged |  | 75 | 67.8 |
|  | Students With Disabilities |  | 58.8 | 55.6 |
|  | English Language Learners |  | 50 | 46.4 |
| Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |
| English Language | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 39.8 | 35.4 | 32.3 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 31.7 | 25.4 | 22.2 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 9.1 | 13.6 | 9.1 |
|  | English Language Learners | 7.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 60 | 58.9 | 57.6 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 52.3 | 54.1 | 47.6 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 71.4 | 45 | 45.5 |
|  | English Language Learners | 21.4 | 29.6 | 17.9 |


|  | Grade 5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number/\% <br> Proficiency | Fall | Winter |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{array}$ | Math Ach. | Math LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS <br> Ach. | MS Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2019-20 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | C \& C <br> Accel <br> $2019-20$ |
| SWD | 24 | 50 |  | 30 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 44 | 67 |  | 44 | 60 |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 59 | 67 | 58 | 58 | 50 | 50 | 42 |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 72 | 77 |  | 72 | 61 |  | 85 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 55 | 68 | 56 | 55 | 53 | 47 | 46 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{array}$ | Math Ach. | Math LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { SS } \\ \text { Ach. } \end{gathered}$ | MS Accel. | Grad Rate $2017-18$ | C \& C <br> Accel <br> $2017-18$ |
| SWD | 29 | 47 | 38 | 42 | 58 | 40 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 50 | 59 | 55 | 54 | 68 | 57 | 28 |  |  |  |  |
| ASN | 70 |  |  | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 33 | 53 |  | 50 | 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 63 | 64 | 51 | 62 | 68 | 53 | 43 |  |  |  |  |


| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Math Ach. | Math LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS <br> Ach. | MS Accel |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { C \& C } \\ \text { Accel } \\ 2017-18 \end{array}$ |
| WHT | 82 | 63 | 55 | 84 | 58 |  | 71 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 57 | 62 | 47 | 61 | 64 | 59 | 37 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELA } \\ & \text { LG } \\ & \text { L25\% } \end{aligned}$ | Math Ach. | Math LG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Math } \\ & \text { LG } \\ & \text { L25\% } \end{aligned}$ | Sci Ach. | SS <br> Ach. | MS Accel. |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { C \& C } \\ \text { Accel } \\ 2016-17 \end{gathered}$ |
| SWD | 31 | 38 | 30 | 31 | 38 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 40 | 53 | 42 | 39 | 49 | 50 | 25 |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 60 | 60 |  | 47 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 54 | 54 | 39 | 56 | 56 | 50 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 74 | 66 |  | 83 | 65 | 50 | 69 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 55 | 56 | 43 | 56 | 57 | 51 | 54 |  |  |  |  |

## 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) | 60 |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | NO |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41\% All Students | 1 |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 53 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 478 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | $99 \%$ |
| Percent Tested |  |
|  | Subgroup Data |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 37 |
| 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 | NO |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? |  |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 69 |
| 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 | 54 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?
FY21 Winter Diagnostics vs FSA FY21 results show:
ELA:
Grade 3 predicted 3+ of 59.8 vs. 60.49% proficient on FSA (+.69)
Grade 4 predicted 3+ of 58.2 vs. 63% proficient on FSA (+7.8)
Grade 5 predicted 3+ of 59.7 vs. 73.61% proficient on FSA (+13.4%)
Math:
Grade 3 predicted 3+ of 71.6 vs. 60.49% proficient on FSA (-11.11%)
Grade 4 predicted 3+ of 59% for 4th GR and 100% for AMP students vs. overall of 55.42% proficient
on FSA.
Grade 5 predicted 3+ of 56% for 5th GR and 94.4% of AMP students vs. overall of 65.71% proficient
on FSA.
Science:
Grade 5 predicted 3+ of 59.7% vs. 62% proficient on FSA (+2.3%)
End of Year Results for Adaptive Technology:
Percent Proficient in iReady: K 90%, 1 69%, 2 66%, 3 78%, 4 58%, and 5 64%.
Percent of Students with Appropriate Progress in Successmaker: K 84%, 1 81%, 2 77%, 3 94%, }
85%,5 89%
Based on this data trend, our focus will be to maintain gains and further our success in ELA and Science, while focusing on foundational skills and remediation in Mathematics.
```

We will specifically focus on our ESSA identified subgroup of SWD to ensure they receive targeted support through small group, tutorials, and workshops to address skill deficits.

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

Our Math results demonstrate the greatest need for improvement, with only $55 \%$ of students making learning gains on the FSA. While data shows that $94 \%$ of last year's 3rd graders and $85 \%$ of last year's 4th graders made appropriate progress in Successmaker, students need to increase their gains beyond "appropriate progress" to make up for deficits. Through targeted small group instruction and increased time on Math skills, teachers will tailor learning to individual student needs.

Similarly, our ELA results indicate that we need to increase the amount of learning gains for our students, to close the gap between our proficient and non-proficient students. With $35 \%$ of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders scoring a level 1 or 2 on the FY21 FSA, we need to target our support of students to move them to proficient or higher.

Targeted support will be provided in both subjects for our ESE and ESOL students, both through push-in teaching and strategy groups during and after school.

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

During FY21, our 5th grade math department went through two changes to the classroom teacher during the first two months of school. One teacher resigned the first week and the replacement was excessed to another school during the budget process. With 5th grade being the core group of students from which learning gains were calculated, this had a significant impact on learning. Couple this with the fact that many students were learning virtually between March and October of 2020, and our Math courses had some rather significant disruptions to instruction during a pivotal time of foundational skills. Students struggled to gain the necessary technology skills and routines to be successful in a virtual environment, with multiple changes to their Math teacher.

Tutorials were difficult to staff and poorly attended by students in upper grades, resulting in most remediation occuring during the Math block, with limited time. Additionally, many students did not have wifi access at home until late October 2020. The ability to group students based on skill set deficits was limited by Covid practices, and teachers were striving to learn the technology along with the students. By the winter/early spring, most teachers had learned to use technology to group students by skill deficits, but even these strategies lacked the engaging hands-on approach that is typically taken in small strategy groups.

This year teachers and students already have the technology skills to start the year with strong strategy groups and have learned how to group within Covid safety protocols.

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

Our FY21 ELA results indicated multiple improvements in comparison to FY19 results. Our 3rd grade ELA results decreased the percentage of students scoring a Level 1 by $5 \%$. 5th grade Language Arts improved our percentage of proficient students by $12 \%$. 5th grade Science improved our percentage of proficient students by $13 \%$ as well.

Our FY21 adaptive technology results indicate a growth median of over $100 \%$ in grades 3 , 4, and 5 as well. 3rd grade's growth median was $127 \%$, 4th grade at $140 \%$, and 5 th grade at $163 \%$.

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

We attribute our successes in ELA to the intentional, multi-year approach to literacy instruction. Students have the opportunity to return to the same skills and areas of learning each and every year, deepening their knowledge and broadening their experience. By having a multi-year approach to content vocabulary development through the piloted CKLA program, our students arrived to 5th grade with a strong content vocabulary. With opportunities for vertical planning with writing, teachers were able to compare and calibrate their expectations as well as plan collectively regarding the vertical progression of strategies and common practices. Supplemental time was used to target support with multiple teachers teaching students in strategy groups in other classrooms via Google Meet.

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

ELA - teachers in grades K-2 will be trained and supported with the roll out of the Benchmark curriculum and the new phonics program and techniques that are included. Teachers in grades K-5 will be trained and supported with the roll out of the Voyager supplemental program for use during supplemental time as well, a comprehensive approach to address learning gaps in literacy. Teachers will utilize common planning time through professional learning communities to collaborate regarding these new programs and to plan strategically for students.

Science - there is a need to return to hands on experiences for students. Through our Subaru Loves Education Grant, we are funding additional hands-on materials for a new Science Lab, expanding lab
access to students in grades 2-5.
Math - With a renewed focus on small group math instruction, teachers will utilize common planning time through professional learning communities to plan for targeted skill groups during rotations. Professional development will be provided through common planning time to utilize Successmaker for targeted lesson assignments. PTO will spearhead the development of a supplemental program for Math skills as a school-wide initiative.

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.

ELA - Our school will work closely with our Benchmark Instructional Specialist, who will work alongside teachers to plan, model, and support with the roll out of benchmark and Voyager. She will provided embedded professional development throughout the school year, tailored to the specific needs of the team. Every two weeks, administration will facilitate data dives and action planning around progress monitoring, student groups, and use of supplemental time.

Math - Expert teachers will provide opportunities for peers to visit their classrooms during small group rotations, to model effective strategies, problem-solve, and coach. Through this model, we will calibrate math expectations to guarantee that every student has access to a successful learning environment.

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

Standards-based instruction and differentiating for small group support will continue to be our primary focus for core curriculum, as outlined above.

To increase our reading proficiency in grade 3, the master schedule has been designed to allow for additional teacher support during supplemental time for third grade, allowing teachers to have smaller groups with more variety of focus, guaranteeing that students receive supplemental time tailored to their individual needs rather than a whole-group approach. This will be provided in addition to the small group rotations in the core block, when students receiving ESE and ESOL students will be sign twice a day during small group rotations as well as an additional time during supplemental time.

By utilizing teacher experts in the building to create calibration time, modeling, and coaching, we will develop the leadership capacity of our teachers in addition to the collaborative culture between teachers. These factors will sustain the work beyond a single year of focus and have long lasting effects in years to come.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

## Areas of Focus:

## \#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

To ensure effective and targeted instruction for success of all students in English Language Arts in alignment with District LTO 1: Increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade to $75 \%$.

When reviewing our school data, we see that our lowest subgroup performance is within ELA performance. ESSA identified students with disabilities as an area for Targeted

Area of Focus Description and
Rationale: Support \& Intervention. Reading provides a direct correlation to performance in other content areas as well, including Science and Mathematics.

While FY21 showed a $7 \%$ improvement in learning gains compared to FY19 as well as a 6\% improvement in L25 learning gains, we saw a 3\% decrease in the overall percentage of students achieving a proficient score for the FY22 FSA for ELA.

With only 60\% of last year's 3rd graders and 63\% of last year's 4th graders scoring a Level 3 or higher on the ELA FSA in FY22, there is a clear need for targeted interventions in grades 3-5.
Measurable Outcome:

## Monitoring:

Increase GR 3 ELA proficiency by at least 5 percentage points (from $60 \%$ to $65 \%$ ) as determined by the FSA in June of 2022.
Monitoring is an essential piece to achieving student success. Without it, students could continue using ineffective strategies for the entire year. iReady Diagnostics will be utilized for a comparison throughout the year, along with additional measures such as district assessments and diagnostics. A data dive will take place every two weeks, alongside administration, to monitor student progress and adjust strategies as necessary. This time will be utilized to review student progress, lesson plans, adjust action plans, determine needs for professional development, and adjustments to student groupings for small group, supplemental, and tutoring.
Person responsible
for monitoring outcome:

Melinda Springman (melinda.springmanherrera@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidencebased Strategy:

1. Bi-weekly data dives will take place, where teachers will monitor short- and long-term goals and discuss practice adjustments. These meetings will be focused on long term measures such as iReady and district diagnostics at appropriate times when those assessments are given.
2. Teachers will utilize formative assessments between these times to narrow in on specific skills for practice, assessment, and adjustment. These formative assessments will be determined by the teacher teams through collaboration, based on the current needs of the curriculum as well as foundational deficits that need to be addressed.
3. Teachers will use a similar format to monitor the progress of students during supplemental time, with initial diagnostics utilized for groupings at the start of the year, with iReady Toolkit recommended materials utilized with small groups who need substantial support.
4. Teachers will utilize Voyager and Benchmark curriculum with students who are less than 2 years behind.

Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:

1. Research shows that highly effective schools make data-informed decisions about instruction through professional learning communities and common planning.
2. By using long-term results such as diagnostics as guideposts, teachers will be able to pinpoint and determine which skill deficits need a targeted short term focus and when is the best time to do so.
3. Teachers will not only review the data to determine what needs to be the focus but will collaborate on which research-based practices are best to use at which time.
4. Voyager is recommended by the School District of Palm Beach County as a valid and effective strategy that pairs well with the new Benchmark Curriculum.

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Bi-weekly data chats and action planning, utilizing data related to the current point of instruction 2. Formative assessments, designed by teacher teams, will be utilized to do targeted strategies between larger district assessments.
2. Teachers will meet to review progress of students receiving supplemental support to determine necessary adjustments and possible referrals to the SBT process.
3. Teachers will utilize the Voyager program for students who are within 2 years of being on level, which means completion of training and purchase of additional resources is necessary.
Person
Responsible
Melinda Springman (melinda.springmanherrera@palmbeachschools.org)
Student goal-setting and monitoring, aligned to measures determined in bi-weekly data chats. Students monitoring their own learning, with opportunities to celebrate short- and long-term goal achievements.

Person
Responsible
Dava Hamerling (dava.hamerling@palmbeachschools.org)

## \#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

To ensure effective and targeted instruction for success of all students in Mathematics aligned with with District LTO 2: Ensure high school readiness.
\(\left.\begin{array}{ll} \& When reviewing our school data, we see that our performance decreased from 2019 to <br>
Area of \& 2021 in all three categories of Mathematics: a 6\% drop in achievement, a 9\% drop in <br>

Focus \& learning gains, and a 2\% drop in L25 learning gains. We know that Mathematics\end{array}\right]\)| Description | performance has a direct impact on high school readiness, college preparation, as well as |
| :--- | :--- |
| and | cross-curricular connections to Science at the middle and high school level. |

Adaptive Technology through Successmaker shows that the mean gain per grade level for each grade level was as follows: K at $.85,1$ at $.78,2$ at .74 , 3 at $.95,4$ at .77 , and 5 at .48 . This shows us that the calculated mean yielded less than a year of growth for Mathematics in FY21.

## Measurable Increase Math proficiency by 5 percentage points (from $64 \%$ to $69 \%$ ) as determined by

 Outcome:FSA by June 2022.
Successmaker initial placement and current course levels will be utilized for a comparison throughout the year, along with additional measures such as district assessments and diagnostics. A data dive will take place every two weeks, alongside administration, to monitor student progress and adjust strategies as necessary.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

## Evidence-

 based Strategy:Dava Hamerling (dava.hamerling@palmbeachschools.org)

1. Teachers will utilize bi-weekly data chats to review formative assessments and adjust action plans accordingly.
2. Expert Math teachers will be utilized to calibrate and model small group strategies for their peers.
3. Following the calibration and modeling, walk throughs will be conducted to determine success of implementation and any additional supports deemed necessary.
4. Teachers needing additional support will be assigned to an administrator for additional coaching, with possible support provided by the district if needed.

## Rationale

for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:

Research tells us that professional development in isolation is ineffective. Utilizing expert teachers to design continuous, job-embedded professional development creates sustainable change and expanded knowledge. In prior years, SOE has had great success with this model, when we utilized teacher experts to calibrate and model expectations for reading running records, resulting in one of the strongest correlations between RRR results and FSA results in the district.

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Facilitate bi-weekly data chats utilizing formative Math data.
2. Identify, calibrate, and prepare expert teachers to facilitate calibration and modeling.
3. Conduct walkthroughs to determine any additional support necessary.
4. Administration will develop a support plan for teachers identified as needing extra support.
5. Design and implement Math Incentive Program, to be championed during lunch and teacher led PE periods, with incentives sponsored by PTO.
Person Responsible

Using the 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 looking at SafeSchoolsforAlex.org for 2019-2020, we see our school ranks \#532 out of 1,395 , which is low when compared to all elementary schools statewide. We reported . 4 incidents per 100 students in 2019-2020. This rating was for a total of 552 students, with a total of 2 incidents for the 2019-2020 school year. We were rated low for violent incidents with 1 report, very low for property incidents with 0 reports, and high for drug/public order incidents, with 1 report for disruption on campus. We also rated very low for suspension information with zero suspensions.

To support our students and make an impact on maintaining a safe learning environment, we will continue our Single School Culture efforts through our work with Positive Behavior Intervention Systems to reinforce good behaviors through school-wide initiatives as well as individual and group recognitions for success. As a PBIS Model School, we will keep our students focused on learning and kindness.

## 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.

At South Olive Elementary we are Ohana. Ohana means family. Family means nobody gets left behind or forgotten. We are constantly striving to live up to this motto and to create a positive school culture and environment. Our School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SwPBS) work tirelessly to ensure that there is a positive climate for students, faculty and staff. At South Olive we have the "PAWS" system in place to demonstrate school wide expectations. PAWS stands for:
Practice Kindness
Act Safely
Work Together
Show Respect
Our PAWS matrix is posted in classrooms and throughout the building. Students are expressly taught by their teachers to use and refer to our PAWS matrix. Our matrix covers all settings and situations on campus including the hallways, Cafeteria, bathrooms, playground, computer labs, as well as virtual learning.

Our SwPBS committee also makes sure our teachers and students are celebrated. Classes have a chance to earn positive behavior notes in the form of a paper "PAW" that are displayed on a huge bulletin board in the hallway for all to see. At the end of each trimester, one class one each grade level is celebrated with a special treat, party, or extra recess time. Also, each week teachers are asked to fill out positive office referrals for a student in their classroom. Students who are referred are called to the office where their referral is read aloud, they are given a treat and if possible student pictures are posted on Twitter. Another way we celebrate students is when they reach a goal whether it is academic or behaviorally, they can "ring the bell" in the front office. Students are asked to come down in the morning to ring the bell with the assistant principal. The student states the goal they meet, ring a rather large bell for the entire office and most of the front hall to hear! Their picture is taken and it is placed on a bulletin board for all to see. Each month, our school counselor gives out Character Counts Awards, teachers nominate a student who exemplifies the monthly characteristic. A small ceremony is held honoring the student from each class and one student is chosen randomly each month to win a bicycle. Students are also celebrated with a picture to Twitter when they are "Caught being Kind". For all our hard work in the last couple of years, South Olive was recognized as a Gold Level Tier 1 Model PBIS school for the 2019-2020 school year and again as a School of Resilience in 2020-2021 by the Florida BPIS Project.

In addition to SwPBS, South Olive ensures all stakeholders are involved through a strong Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) and School Advisory Committee (SAC), which are both led by parents of students at the school and involve teachers, administration, and parents working together. Our PTO Executive Board is comprised of a dedicated group of parents who have remain involved for years.

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

Principal: Promotes collaboration and fellowship among staff members, creates a positive environment where teachers can share their best practices with one another while responding to student needs. Designs positive recognition practices for both staff and students to celebrate achievements and positive influencers, while encouraging others through demonstrating and uplifting these practices.

Assistant Principal: Facilitates PBIS committee, meets with teachers on a regular basis to determine if PBIS practices outlined above are effective and determines when adjustments are necessary.

School Counselor: Supports the positive culture as our SEL coordinator, modeling SEL activities for faculty, recording teacher / classroom exemplars to share out for best practices. Facilitates small groups for students with a variety of social/emotional needs, assists families and students in crisis, and serves as a member of the intervention team.

Mental Health Behavioral Professional: Supports families in crisis by connecting them with both internal and external resources, facilitates small groups and one-on-one sessions for students with a variety of social/ emotional needs, connects with staff to provide wrap-around services for those in need.

Teachers: Incorporate SWPBS into their daily work, their classroom communities, and their operations. Create a safe, nurturing environment for students, where the goal is to improve social, emotional, behavioral, and academic outcomes for students. Teachers provide Tier 1 supports to all students by making sure they have an equitable and equal opportunity to be in a positive environment. Targeted Tier 2 support for some students focuses on specific skill deficits and improving their outcomes. Tier 3 intensive support for a few students who need an individualized plan to guarantee their success in a safe environment.

In addition, as stipulated within Florida Statute \& Policy 2.09 our school ensures all students receive equal access to the pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to
develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 Instruction will also be infused as applicable to appropriate grade levels including but not limited to:
(a) History of the Holocaust, the systematic, planned annihilation of European Jews and other groups by Nazi Germany, a watershed event in the history of humanity, to be taught in a manner that leads to an investigation of human behavior, an understanding of the ramifications of prejudice, racism, and stereotyping, and an examination of what it means to be a responsible and respectful person, for the purposes of encouraging tolerance of diversity in a pluralistic society and for nurturing and protecting democratic values and institutions, including the policy, definition, and historical and current examples of anti-Semitism, as described in s. 1000.05(7), and the prevention of anti-Semitism. The second week in November shall be designated as "Holocaust Education Week" in this state in recognition that November is the anniversary of Kristallnacht, widely recognized as a precipitating event that led to the Holocaust.
(b) History of African and African Americans including the history of African peoples before the political conflicts that led to the development of slavery, the passage to America, the enslavement experience, abolition, and the contributions of African Americans to society. Instructional materials shall include the contributions of African Americans to American society.
(c) Women's Contribution
(d) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

These concepts are introduced as stand-alone teaching points and may also be integrated into other core subjects: math, reading, social studies, science. Our goal is for our students to learn the content and curriculum taught through Florida State Statute 1003.42 to ensure inclusiveness for all.

Teachers follow the scope and sequence as outlined on the Palm Beach County curriculum resource blender, This ensures that teachers have a concrete timeline as well as the resources to provide quality instruction on the mandated curriculum Additionally, topics are often addressed in greater depth through the school counselor during her instruction on the wheel and special events held throughout the school year.

Students will also learn character development, the character development curriculum shall stress the qualities of patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III. A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA |  |  |  | \$10,373.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
|  | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0572 - South Olive Elementary School | School Improvement Funds |  | \$10,373.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: SAC approved School Improvement funds to be utilized for remedial MATH and ELA instructional materials, including but not limited to teacher resources and consumable student materials. |  |  |  |
| 2 | III. A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math |  |  |  | \$0.00 |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  | \$10,373.00 |

