

The School District of Palm Beach County

Grove Park Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Grove Park Elementary School

8330 N MILITARY TRL, West Palm Beach, FL 33410

<https://gps.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Marzella Mitchell

Start Date for this Principal: 2/22/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Grove Park Elementary School

8330 N MILITARY TRL, West Palm Beach, FL 33410

<https://gpes.palmbeachschools.org>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

In addition, Grove Park's mission aligns with the district's overall mission for students and school accountability:

The School District of Palm Beach County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mitchell, Marzella	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School Accountability, Student Achievement Curriculum/Instructional/Assessment Alignment to Standards Progress Monitoring (Student Proficiency, Gains, Lowest 25%) Closing Achievement Gap Programs (IB; Holiday Camps, Tutorials) Professional Development, School Sustainability (Formal & Embedded PD, Coaching, PLC) Highly Qualified Staff IB Compliance -Family Involvement Trainings, related to core content areas Curriculum Nights and School Tours School Advisory Council (SAC) Strategies that address/reduce Absenteeism Partnerships Volunteerism - School Safety FortifyFL Koginto Crisis and Drill Compliance Systems, Routines of the Instructional Day swPBS (Climate, School Morale, Celebrations, Learner Profiles) Clubs (Enrichment): Ballet, Drumline, SECME, Leadership - Facilities Classroom Environments Maintenance Work Orders
Chernow, Tracy	Magnet Coordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trainings, related to core content areas Curriculum Nights and School Tours School Advisory Council (SAC) Strategies that address/reduce Absenteeism Curriculum/Instructional/Assessment Alignment to Standards Progress Monitoring (Student Proficiency, Gains, Lowest 25%) Closing Achievement Gap Programs (IB; Holiday Camps, Tutorials) Professional Development, School Sustainability (Formal & Embedded PD, Coaching, PLC)

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 2/22/2021, Marzella Mitchell

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

4

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

47

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

542

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

4

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	114	88	86	88	84	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	0	34	23	21	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	39	39	26	32	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
Course failure in Math	25	21	27	21	31	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	24	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	28	36	58	61	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243
FY21 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	55	46	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
FY21 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	51	48	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157

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	19	21	33	43	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/17/2021

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	97	90	94	88	75	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	29	19	26	24	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	5	9	11	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	30	47	38	28	54	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Course failure in Math	0	19	29	21	19	27	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	2220
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	27	33	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	47	58	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	21	28	28	22	28	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	40	4	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	3	2	3	10	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	97	90	94	88	75	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	29	19	26	24	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	5	9	11	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	30	47	38	28	54	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Course failure in Math	0	19	29	21	19	27	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	2220
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	27	33	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	47	58	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	21	28	28	22	28	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	40	4	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	3	2	3	10	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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				39%	58%	57%	37%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	63%	58%	52%	61%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	56%	53%	53%	56%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	68%	63%	47%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains				77%	68%	62%	46%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	59%	51%	39%	53%	47%
Science Achievement				42%	51%	53%	30%	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	34%	54%	-20%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	62%	-24%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	59%	-17%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	65%	3%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	67%	-5%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	65%	-3%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	51%	-9%	53%	-11%
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 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-2 we will use iReady for Fall, Winter & Spring

In grades 3-5 we will use iReady in the Fall, & Winter, in the Spring. PM UNify for Math K-5 and science grades 3-5

-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.

-SuccessMaker is an adaptive learning program that continuously personalizes math instruction for student growth and differentiation

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36.4	23.2	46.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	34.2	22.1	46.1
	Students With Disabilities	44.4	11.1	33.3
	English Language Learners	30.8	15.4	44.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	65.0	65.1	80.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	63.2	63.0	80.0
	Students With Disabilities	100	70.	80.
	English Language Learners	40.0	73.1	92.6
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41.0	54.1	60.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	25.0	23.1	42.9
	Students With Disabilities	25.0	23.1	42.9
	English Language Learners	33.3	53.8	59.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		82.8	82.5
	Economically Disadvantaged		83.1	83.7
	Students With Disabilities		63.6	64.3
	English Language Learners		74.1	82.1

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		53.2	54.0
	Economically Disadvantaged		54.8	53.8
	Students With Disabilities		53.8	50.0
	English Language Learners		50.0	52.9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	66.7	61.3	62.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	69.1	64.4	64.6
	Students With Disabilities	42.9	42.9	40.0
	English Language Learners	73.3	64.7	76.5
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		50.7	44.4
	Economically Disadvantaged		51.6	46.3
	Students With Disabilities		26.7	18.8
	English Language Learners		63.2	40.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36.0	30.0	29.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	35.7	30.1	29.9
	Students With Disabilities	30.0	5.9	0.0
	English Language Learners	28.6	22.7	13.6

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		48.8	51.0
	Economically Disadvantaged		48.8	52.7
	Students With Disabilities		25.0	23.1
	English Language Learners		33.3	33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	73.4	48.3	37.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	72.7	48.8	38.9
	Students With Disabilities	75.0	38.5	27.6
	English Language Learners	68.4	38.1	20.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	70.9	66.7	73.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	70.7	66.3	75.3
	Students With Disabilities	62.5	57.7	59.3
	English Language Learners	66.7	56.5	58.3

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	29		19	16		17				
ELL	36	46	42	36	20	10	37				
BLK	25	33	38	29	19	8	39				
HSP	47	50		40	35		29				
FRL	34	44	35	33	24	21	39				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	23	50	33	45	74	70	25				
ELL	44	70	68	70	80	67	37				
BLK	35	60	67	62	73	70	39				
HSP	43	71	64	71	83		42				
FRL	38	63	65	64	76	68	39				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	31	19	20	38	38	18				
ELL	35	52	47	51	54		20				
BLK	34	52	55	41	41	30	29				
HSP	40	50	40	59	55		18				
WHT	55			45							
FRL	37	53	53	46	46	39	31				

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	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	280
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	35
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	
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	30
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	41
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
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?

Grove Park increased its school-letter grade from a "C" to a "B." Although there was a slight increase in ELA from 37% in FY18 to 39% in FY19, ELA proficiency continues to be the lowest performance measure as a trend.

2016, 24%

2017, 28%

2018, 37%

2019, 39% (compared to mathematics-66% and science-42%)

Contributing factors to GP's ELA growth trend are students entering third grade as struggling readers, lack of word knowledge and ability to determine word meaning in context, understanding higher text complexity, and overall stamina.

Overall increases include the following:

- 17.4 points in math achievement
- 30.5 points in math gains
- 30.2 points in Low 25 math gains
- 1.2 points in ELA achievement
- 11.9 points in ELA gains
- 13.4 points in Low 25 ELA gains
- 11.1 points in science achievement

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

ELA had the greatest gap when compared both to state averages and district averages.

District:

Proficiency 59%; Learning Gains, 57%; Lowest 25%, 47%

Grove Park, compared to state averages, by grade level:

Proficiency:

3rd Grade (GP 35%, state 58%)

4th Grade (GP 39%, state 58%)

5th Grade (GP 43%, state 56%)

Although trends show a gradual increase of ELA proficiency over the last four years from 24%, 28%, 37%, to 39%, the gap compared to the state's average is 23 points in 3rd grade;

19 points in 4th; and,

13 points in 5th

Factors that contribute to this gap

- Students knowledge of the standards, lack of ability to make connections, vocabulary development, stamina, and testing taking strategies.
- Teachers' lack of deep understanding of standards; and instructional delivery of high yielding instructional strategies that increase students' mastery.

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

ELA Proficiency, 39%

- Teacher capacity of the state standards
- Cultural Competence
- Lack of overall school readiness

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

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

Math Gain s2019-77%
2018-47%

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

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

Consistent monitoring, collaboration at PLC's and frequent modeling of skills

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

1. Science - Re-focus emphasis in science and implement content and increase a deeper understanding. We need to provide additional support to help with achievement in this content area including but not limited to mentoring, tutorials, double down model, focused teacher planning/ collaboration & professional development to ensure we meet the needs of all of our students in an equitable and accessible manner. Science needs to be a focus in grades K-5.
2. ELA and Math Continuum - During PLCs, focus on developing effective and relevant instruction through: unpacking standards, analyzing data, developing standards based lesson using vetted resources and materials from the District, share best practices, following/participating with the coaching continuum model, incorporate research based strategies included but not limited to GO-To Strategies, balanced literacy, small group instruction, and differentiated learning. Teachers will engage in common planning to improve instructional capacity. Professional development opportunities include district support/ training, in-school coaching opportunities, and independent study. Teachers are encouraged to share best practices at PLCs & Common Planning
3. Reading Proficiency/ Low 25% Learning Gains - Increase learning gains by ensuring standards based instruction and effective the use of research based strategies and resources, we will ensure student learning and improved student achievement towards grade level success and ensure continuous improvement. Low 25% students will be connected with a reading endorsed/certified interventionist to ensure closing of the achievement gap. Implement a tutoring program in the FY22 school year, and these students will continue receiving priority for tutoring sessions that include math, ELA, and writing.

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 in Core Curriculum for K-2
Grades 3-5 building capacity in the instructional process
Building rapport with parents and families

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

Grove Park will have additional small groups occurring through the extra support staff that have been added to assist in increase of reading proficiency in grades K-5 Those additional services are in the areas of phonics and phonemic awareness and an overall increase in vocabulary. The extra staff will assist with monitoring and remediation of skills.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To ensure progress towards student achievement and learning gains in ELA (reading and writing) and Math to align with the District's Strategic Plan; Strategic Theme: Effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all learners; 1; increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade. Historically, our Gr. 3-5 ELA proficiency has very slowly increased, and only this past year we decreased from 39% to 34% for a variety of reasons in the Gr. 3-5 ELA proficiency, according to FSA. Overall, every area decreased dramatically so the focus is to increase reading proficiency as well as learning gains. 39% to 69% in Mathematics from FY 17-18 to FY 18-19. Additionally, our subgroup data shows that our Students with Disabilities (SWD), Hispanic, and Black students are not making adequate progress or gains in reading and math compared to other years or other subgroups. In order to align with the District's plan and to ensure progress towards achievement in reading we need to increase in these areas through the use of small group.

Measurable Outcome: increase ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 by 12% from 34% to 46%

Monitoring: Small group instruction will be monitored by the Principal and AP, as well as by the support people in place e.g SSSC. Consistent meetings with teachers and tutors that will be placed to assist with the model of small group instruction. Grove Park implements multiple measures of analyzing school-wide data that drives the RTI process. Student assessments include but are not limited to FLCKERS, Diagnostics, Performance Matters Assessments, Florida Standards. Assessments, iReady district diagnostics, and RRR. The annual test administered for ELL students is ACCESS. In addition, the WIDA is used to assess ELL students' proficiency in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Teachers are trained by instructional coaches to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction based on the results of data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marzella Mitchell (marzella.mitchell@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use of high yielding strategy of small groups, This will Guide student practice by asking questions and providing feedback. Small group instruction will also allow teachers to check that students understand text Full curriculum alignment to standards (also, instruction, assessment, and resources)
- Whole (Explicit), Guided, Small Group Instruction (tailored to needs of each child)
- Increased Rigor
Scale, Expected Outcomes, Learning Target
High Order Questions (Marzano Taxonomy, to knowledge utilization from retrieval)
Question Stems
Contextual Evidence and Proof
Academic Language and Conversations
Vocabulary in Context (spiraed throughout the year in the modules)
Regular practice, high text complexity
Whole Literacy combined with performance based approaches

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

- Expanding Students Overall Schema & Background Knowledge
- Field Trips (transferring and applying knowledge outside of the classroom)
- Unit Integration of STEM components
- Special Clubs (Ballet, SECME, Leadership, Drumline, Art, Future Teachers, etc)
- Technology Integration (SMART Panels, too all teachers, 1:1 iPad Rollout, Chromebooks)

Small group provides intensive instruction on specific skills on a daily basis that promotes the development of the various components of reading proficiency to students who show minimal progress after reasonable time in tier 2 small group instruction (tier 3).

Assuring Curriculum Alignment

When regularly exposed to standards-based instruction, assessment, and resources, students are better equipped to achieve proficiency and gains.

- Whole Group, Guided, Small Group Instruction

When instruction goes beyond teacher-explicit delivery to include small group, instruction is then tailored to the individual need of students, for a personal approach to learning.

- Increased Rigor

When students are exposed to high-yielding strategies through both explicit and small group instruction, students' capacity to apply critical thinking and problem-solving is increased.

- Expanded Student Schema and Background Knowledge

Students are better able to connect to text and concepts when knowledge of vocabulary,

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

GP will decrease the amount of suspensions and increase the student mentorships and community stakeholders to assist with building a growth mindset within the students. We will also offer clubs on the campus that will assist with increasing a skill set that helps with the whole child.

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.

In an effort to build cultural relationships between teachers and students and all of our stakeholders, we stress the school and the district's statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and align with our school's School improvement strategies. Our school will embrace the varied cultures on the campus and within the community. Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 10003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8) (b), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:

- History of Holocaust
- History of Africans and African Americans
- Hispanic Contributions
- Women's Contributions
- Sacrifices of Veterans
- Florida History
- Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.
- Health Education
- Hosting a multicultural event that will showcase the diverse cultures of students within our school to unite and develop single school culture.
- Provide professional development to staff on increasing positive interactions with students.
- Attend District provided Professional Development on multicultural offerings.
- Embed cultural activities within the curriculum and daily course work (e.g., reading selections, writing prompts).
- Assure all teachers will participate in the process of discussing climate guidelines
- Identify and engage school community stakeholders (e.g. parents, students, teachers, school counselors, etc.) in assessing the current state of the cultural awareness and student-teacher relationships (data-based decision making). Identify on-campus "relationship experts" to implement evidence-based strategies to develop cultural awareness, and cultural responsiveness to improve student-teacher relations, and close existing social justice/equity gaps
- Engage in collaborative efforts between community agencies and our school to infuse a mentoring program that will identify ways to support the students based on their individual academic, social, and emotional needs. This, in turn, will create a more supportive school environment that will meet the needs of all students and our stakeholders

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

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. Groups include administration, Teachers, support staff and community business partners.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$173,902.58
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	1411 - Grove Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$132,290.58
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	1411 - Grove Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$41,612.00
Total:						\$173,902.58