

The School District of Palm Beach County

Montessori Academy of Early Enrichment, Inc



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Montessori Academy of Early Enrichment, Inc

6300 LAKE WORTH RD, Greenacres, FL 33463

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michael King

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2005

| | |
|--|--|
| 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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (58%) |
| 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 | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Montessori Academy of Early Enrichment, Inc

6300 LAKE WORTH RD, Greenacres, FL 33463

[no web address on file]

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 | 86% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 84% |

School Grades History

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

The Montessori Academy of Early Enrichment’s mission is to provide a quality learning experience that is suited to the needs of the child. We believe that all children are unique individuals with different needs, interests, and abilities.

Our goal is to aid children in their work of self-creation, to help them become independent learners and thinkers.

We are a child-centered school that focuses on meeting the individual needs of each student therefore, we are committed to providing a safe and nurturing environment where children are respected and permitted to develop at their own natural rate of development.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our guiding principles are accomplished by integrating a language-rich environment into a Montessori based curriculum. The Montessori Method offers individual attention to the whole development of the child.

On this foundation, the child can begin to build a lifetime of personal success and happiness. Just as Dr. Montessori’s pioneering philosophy of education centered around the child, so will the Montessori Academy of Early Enrichment focus on and adapt itself to the interests of the child between Pre-K through fifth (5th) grade.

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 |
|----------------|---------------------------|--|
| Ranck, Jean | Principal | Ensure that academic our policies and curriculum are followed Ensure a safe and secure working environment Develop and track benchmarks for measuring institutional success Help teachers maximize their teaching potential Meet and listen to concerns of students and parents on a regular basis Encourage, guide and assist student leaders and teachers Meeting with parents and administrators on a regular basis for problem resolution Enforce discipline when necessary Provide an atmosphere free of any bias in which students can achieve their maximum potential |
| | ELL Compliance Specialist | Have cultural awareness Community involvement Quality services through best practices Provide support to the students and families we serve |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2005, Michael King

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.*

2

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

9

Total number of students enrolled at the school

168

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.

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 | 36 | 21 | 34 | 28 | 22 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/1/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-----------|-------------|-------|
|-----------|-------------|-------|

Number of students enrolled

Attendance below 90 percent

One or more suspensions

Course failure in ELA

Course failure in Math

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-----------|-------------|-------|
|-----------|-------------|-------|

Students with two or more indicators

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-----------|-------------|-------|
|-----------|-------------|-------|

Retained Students: Current Year

Students retained two or more times

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 | 24 | 29 | 31 | 28 | 37 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | | | | 54% | 58% | 57% | 52% | 57% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 82% | 63% | 58% | 74% | 61% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 56% | 53% | | 56% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 69% | 68% | 63% | 54% | 65% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 82% | 68% | 62% | 53% | 63% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 59% | 51% | | 53% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 79% | 51% | 53% | 31% | 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 | 44% | 54% | -10% | 58% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 62% | -5% | 58% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -44% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 59% | 10% | 56% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 65% | 0% | 62% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 67% | -10% | 64% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 100% | 65% | 35% | 60% | 40% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 51% | 18% | 53% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Istation Reading and Istation Math

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 11/41% | 15/56% | 16/57% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 18/67% | 17/63% | 19/68% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 16/67% | 12/41% | 13/43% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 7/29% | 9/31% | 10/33% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 8/33% | 11/44% | 9/35% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 9/38% | 3/12% | 5/19% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 17/63% | 21/60% | 15/42% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12/52% | 7/21% | 13/33% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |

| Grade 5 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 16/67% | 15/60% | 17/68% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 9/38% | 4/16% | 9/36% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | Students With Disabilities | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |
| | English Language Learners | | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available |

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 | 18 | | | 18 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 69 | | 23 | 23 | | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 57 | | 34 | 29 | | 25 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 55 | | 27 | 23 | | 30 | | | | |
| 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 | 32 | 92 | | 47 | 75 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 75 | | 63 | 79 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 82 | | 68 | 82 | | 83 | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 81 | | 66 | 81 | | 73 | | | | |

| 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 | 11 | 62 | | 39 | 62 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | 71 | | 42 | 56 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 75 | | 52 | 56 | | 42 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 70 | | 48 | 46 | | 21 | | | | |

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 | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| 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 | 253 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 40 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| 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 | 38 |
| 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?

In our school, the majority of students in kindergarten are non-English speakers and their ELA scores are always low. By the time each child enters first grade, they become more proficient in speaking English and their ELA scores improve.

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

Our greatest need for improvement in the 2019 state assessments in both ELA and Math were the bottom 25 percent.

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

The students in the bottom 25 percent, were primarily ELL students, therefore, they had both low ELA and math scores. There needs to be a focus on the ELL students' oral language development, reading vocabulary and comprehension.

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

The data component that demonstrated the most improvement was the ELA reading gains.

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

The ELA reading gains can be attributed to an emphasis on reading remediation computer software and tutoring. We began providing tutoring sessions on Saturdays, during the week and afterschool.

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

A strategy that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning will be to increase parent involvement through training on the remediation software used by students.

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 opportunities that will be provided include training sessions for teachers, where they will learn how to analyze student data, provide individualized lessons to students, which will equip teachers with the necessary skills to work effectively with parents.

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

Professional development logs will be maintained ensuring teachers and staff are attending workshop sessions, and training data will be uploaded into the professional development shell on the school district website.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Analyzed student data on Istation

Measurable Outcome: The data-based objective of the school is to reach 50% or more proficiency in all grade levels in English Language Arts.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored by running Istation reports on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jean Ranck (myrajean.ranck@pbcharterschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will coordinate their reading groups based on student reading levels and areas of deficiency as depicted in their Istation ELA reports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students are diagnosed using evidence-based assessments and from the data retrieved, students are remediated according to their areas of deficiencies.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will remediate students based on data and needs. Staff will receive professional development on instructional strategies. Monthly assessment will be collected and reviewed based on student growth and progress. Students will be tutored based on needs.

Person Responsible Jean Ranck (myrajean.ranck@pbcharterschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Analyzed student data on Istation

Measurable Outcome: The data-based objective of the school is to reach 50% or more proficiency in all grade levels in Math.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored by running Istation reports on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jean Ranck (myrajean.ranck@pbcharterschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will coordinate their math instructional groups based on student math levels and areas of deficiency as depicted in their Istation Math reports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students are diagnosed using evidence-based assessments and from the data retrieved, students are remediated according to their areas of deficiencies.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will remediate students based on data and needs. Staff will receive professional development on instructional strategies. Monthly assessment will be collected and reviewed based on student growth and progress. Students will be tutored based on needs.

Person Responsible Jean Ranck (myrajean.ranck@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Data is not on the website

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.

We are a child-centered school that focuses on meeting the individual needs of each student therefore, we are committed to providing a safe and nurturing environment where children are respected and permitted to develop at their own natural rate of development. Teachers and staff are trained on conscious discipline which is a behavior management that focuses on positive behavior management.

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

The school governing board oversees the operations of the school and ensures the school maintains a positive culture and environment for the students and their families through discussions at meetings throughout the year.

The charter department of the School District of Palm Beach County provides a positive support system in facilitating the needs of the school, which includes the training of staff members and the monitoring of school records.

The parents and families of the students are critical stakeholders at our school in promoting a positive culture and providing academic support at home.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| | Total: \$0.00 |
|--|-----------------------------|