

The School District of Palm Beach County

South Grade Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 24 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 26 |

South Grade Elementary School

716 S K ST, Lake Worth, FL 33460

<https://sges.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Ana Arce Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 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* Native American Students* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (40%) |
| 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 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&I:

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 26 |

South Grade Elementary School

716 S K ST, Lake Worth, FL 33460

<https://sges.palmbeachschools.org>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">99%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">97%</p> |

School Grades History

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

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 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.

South Grade Elementary 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.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South Grade 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 Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Arce Gonzalez, Ana | Principal | Leads and provides the common vision for the school to make data driven decision when implementing the RTI in he school. As principal, Dr. Arce manages or supervises all aspects of the educational program. First and foremost, Dr. Arce is the instructional leader of this school. Dr. Arce is responsible for the equitable instructional for all students. She is the decision maker in regards to the master schedule, teacher evaluations and supervision, curriculum council, Palm Beach Model of Instruction, professional development, professional learning community coordination, hiring new teachers and school improvement activities. Dr. Arce is responsible for all budgetary decisions and contracts. |
| Barr, Loris | Assistant Principal | Mrs. Barr mirrors the vision of the principal by supporting the RTI-SBT process and all other duties as assigned. |
| Fenn, Martina | Instructional Coach | The reading coach stays current on research and best practices to analyze and support the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student needs, utilizing district resources to develop effective based intervention strategies. The coach uses student assessments and monitoring data to promote progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis. Participates with the schools professional development team to create and implement quality and staff development for specific instructional areas of weaknesses. The coach participates in school professional learning communities by grade K-5. |
| Clark, Celia | Administrative Support | Mrs. Clark supports the operations of learning, culture and systemic communities. |
| Garcia, Anna | ELL Compliance Specialist | The ESOL Coordinator manages all ELL data, resources, assessments and interventions that support classroom teachers, students and parents. |
| Burritt, Heather | Teacher, ESE | The SBT Leader manages all SBT cases and supports staff and teachers with delivering precise interventions in the classroom. |
| Arbesfeld, Francis | Instructional Coach | The DL coach stays current on research and best practices to analyze and support the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student needs, utilizing district resources to develop effective based intervention strategies. The coach uses student assessments and monitoring data to promote progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis. Participates with the schools professional development team to create and implement quality and staff development for specific instructional areas of weaknesses. The coach participates in school professional learning communities by grade level K-5. |
| Wilcock, Donna | Instructional Coach | The math coach stays current on research and best practices to analyze and support the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student needs, utilizing district |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---|
| | | resources to develop effective based intervention strategies. The coach uses student assessments and monitoring data to promote progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis. Participates with the schools professional development team to create and implement quality and staff development for specific instructional areas of weaknesses. The coach participates in school professional learning communities by grade K-5. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Ana Arce Gonzalez

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.*

8

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

650

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.

4

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 | 89 | 92 | 114 | 118 | 96 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 631 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 28 | 15 | 20 | 19 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 32 | 88 | 72 | 64 | 71 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 352 |
| Course failure in Math | 13 | 57 | 54 | 63 | 57 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 282 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 68 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 60 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 91 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 |
| FY21 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 91 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 |
| FY21 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 79 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 |

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 | 58 | 57 | 48 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 254 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/21/2021

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 | 106 | 114 | 113 | 133 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 633 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 45 | 34 | 32 | 59 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 8 | 46 | 50 | 72 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 26 | 41 | 44 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| FY20 Math Diag Levels 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 53 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 |
| FY20 ELA Diag Levels 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 65 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 |

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 | 5 | 33 | 41 | 62 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |

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 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |

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 | 62 | 106 | 114 | 113 | 133 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 633 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 45 | 34 | 32 | 59 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 8 | 46 | 50 | 72 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 26 | 41 | 44 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| FY20 Math Diag Levels 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 53 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 |
| FY20 ELA Diag Levels 1 & 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 65 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 |

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 | 5 | 33 | 41 | 62 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |

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 | | | | 32% | 58% | 57% | 29% | 57% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 55% | 63% | 58% | 51% | 61% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56% | 56% | 53% | 56% | 56% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 52% | 68% | 63% | 53% | 65% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 66% | 68% | 62% | 55% | 63% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 59% | 59% | 51% | 49% | 53% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 27% | 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 | 24% | 54% | -30% | 58% | -34% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 62% | -30% | 58% | -26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -24% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 59% | -32% | 56% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 65% | -26% | 62% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 67% | -10% | 64% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 65% | -22% | 60% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 23% | 51% | -28% | 53% | -30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

- FSQ's for grades 2nd-5th ELA
- USA's for grades K-5th Math
- iReady Diagnostics for grades K-5
- Winter District Diagnostics for grade 3-5
- Benchmark Unit Assessments for grades K-2
- iObservation K-5
- Classroom Walkthroughs K-5
- Benchmark Unit Assessments K-2

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 11.1 | 3.9 | 24.0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11.1 | 3.9 | 24.0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 2.3 | 0.0 | 21.3 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 47.8 | 63.9 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 47.8 | 63.9 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 66.7 | 66.7 |
| | English Language Learners | | 43.4 | 58.0 |
| | | | | |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 61.0 | 47.7 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 61.7 | 47.2 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 66.7 | 66.7 |
| | English Language Learners | | 43.4 | 58.0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 66.7 | 65.5 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 66.0 | 65.4 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 68.4 | 66.7 |
| | English Language Learners | | 61.6 | 61.0 |
| | | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 43.5 | 46.2 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 43.5 | 46.2 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| | English Language Learners | | 35.4 | 41.0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 55.2 | 47.9 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 55.2 | 47.9 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 33.3 | 40.0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 53.0 | 43.4 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 37.5 | 38.1 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 37.5 | 38.1 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 33.3 | 21.1 |
| | English Language Learners | | 29.1 | 27.0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Mathematics | All Students | 60.6 | 50.4 | 53.8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 60.6 | 50.4 | 54.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 64.3 | 55.6 | 57.9 |
| | English Language Learners | 51.3 | 41.6 | 44.0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 49.0 | 61.5 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 49.0 | 61.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 52.6 | 65.0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 39.4 | 50.0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Mathematics | All Students | 51.9 | 37.6 | 34.2 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 51.9 | 37.6 | 34.2 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 65.0 | 57.9 | 55.0 |
| | English Language Learners | 40.8 | 31.1 | 25.0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Science | All Students | 50.0 | 43.1 | 58.6 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 50.0 | 43.1 | 58.6 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 52.9 | 55.0 | 70.00 |
| | English Language Learners | 37.5 | 33.8 | 47.4 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |

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 | 19 | 50 | 55 | 39 | 61 | | 32 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 44 | 62 | 34 | 48 | 56 | 22 | | | | |
| AMI | 29 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 61 | | 33 | 56 | | 18 | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 47 | 61 | 35 | 49 | 56 | 28 | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 49 | 63 | 35 | 50 | 52 | 24 | | | | |
| 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 | 26 | 59 | 78 | 48 | 74 | 67 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 56 | 55 | 51 | 67 | 60 | 26 | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 57 | 58 | 45 | 63 | 57 | 33 | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 54 | 53 | 54 | 67 | 60 | 27 | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 40 | | | 30 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 32 | 56 | 56 | 52 | 66 | 59 | 27 | | | | |
| 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 | 25 | 55 | 61 | 36 | 47 | 56 | 29 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 55 | 53 | 52 | 54 | 50 | 23 | | | | |
| AMI | 26 | 39 | | 50 | 59 | | 33 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 63 | 64 | 42 | 60 | 43 | 59 | | | | |
| HSP | 29 | 52 | 54 | 56 | 55 | 59 | 21 | | | | |
| WHT | 31 | 25 | | 46 | 38 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 51 | 57 | 53 | 56 | 51 | 29 | | | | |

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 | 32 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 332 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| 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 | 40 |
| 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 | 34 |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 38 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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?

According to the FSA ELA Diagnostic Assessments, ELA has shown consistent increase in student proficiency with a set back in SY2021 (SY2018 - 28%, SY2019 - 29%; SY2020- 35% and SY2021 - 27%)

This was consistent with all subgroups.

In Math, although it reflects a higher proficiency performance compared to ELA, it has declined 2%-4% points from 2018-2021. However, within certain subgroups, proficiency has increased (i.e., SWD, White, Black).

According to the Science Diagnostic from 2018-2021, it has shown increases and decreased alike. There was a substantial increase in 2019 with a 1% decrease the following year, but with a substantial decrease in 2021.

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

According to the comparison of FY19, FY20 and FY21 ELA Diagnostic, ELA demonstrates the greatest need for improvement with a decline of 8% from 35% (FY20) to 27% (FY21).

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

Contributing factors: We have historically had large populations of ELL students. The contributing factor is the need to support all learners through differentiation. As well, at the beginning of FY21, the majority of students were receiving on-line instruction which wasn't the best modality for ELL learners. As well, attendance was equally a big concern where many students did not receive daily instruction, creating substantial gaps in student learning. We need to develop our teachers to utilize instructional differentiation in a strategic manner. Our focus is to diminish course failure and increase learning gains and achievement. Explicit vocabulary instruction is a school-wide initiative to occur in the context of all content area instruction. Additionally, target support provided for all struggling learners with focus on our ELL and SWD students. ELL resource teachers will assist teachers with small group strategy and skill based instruction. Progress monitoring of student achievement using formative assessment data will occur, with follow up action planning to address area(s) of deficiency. Student and teacher data chats scheduled by administration after analyzing student data.

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

The area that has consistently demonstrated the most improvement has been Math. Comparing FY18 to FY19 Math FSA students increased 11% in learning gains and 6% lowest 25%. A compared to the FY20 Diagnostic student increased 3% in achievement. All subgroups with the exception of Black female (40% decrease to 37%) and SWD female (45% to 33%) had a substantial increase in math performance.

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

Contributing factor: Closely progress monitoring students groupings and intense analysis of data during PLC and grade level meetings. As well, tutors provided small group instruction during math rotation covering necessary foundational skills. After school tutoring twice a week allowed for further practice of skill based instruction. Math coach provided intentional planning and data analysis meetings with grade levels to plan, instruct, asses and reteach. More deliberate planning would need to be done to better support our SWD students and black females to allow for more foundational instruction leading up to learning new concepts.

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

During PLCs, we will focus on developing effective and relevant instruction through: unpacking standards, analyzing data, developing standard based lesson using resources and materials from the District, shared best practices, following/participating with the coaching continuum model, incorporate research based strategies included but not limited to small group instruction and differentiated learning. Teachers will engage in common planning and professional development opportunities. Teachers are encouraged to share best practice during PLC as a way of increasing grad elevel capacity as a whole.

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.

PD/PLC: Teachers will engage in deep, focused PD, collaborative planning, and data analysis to strengthen standards-based instructional practices to accelerate student learning ELA, Math, and Science. PLCs continue to be an active part of our school schedule. Students in grades 3-5 will also embed AVID strategies to support high inquiry level of instruction.

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

The primary focus will continue to be implementing standards-based instruction and differentiating that instruction by providing small group support. Resources and strategies aligned to grade level standards and scaffolds put in place to support students who are not performing at grade level. Funding has been set aside for after school tutorials.

As an early intervention to increase student readiness to enter kindergarten, we offer a school year Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Program supplemented with enrichment hours. This program is supported by the Department of Early Childhood Education and follows all Florida statutes, rules, and contractual mandates, including the use of a developmentally appropriate curriculum that enhances the age-appropriate progress of children in attaining each of the Florida Early Learning performance standards. Participating children are expected to transition to kindergarten ready to learn and be successful in school and later life.

To transition school-based and community children into the kindergarten program at South Grade Elementary, we engage in the following kindergarten transition activities:

- Scheduling of a talk/meeting with preschool children's families
- Distribution of a letter, flyer or informational brochure sent to families of preschool children
- Scheduling opportunities for preschool children to visit a kindergarten class and/or meet their future kindergarten teacher
- Making plans for preschool children to practice kindergarten routines
- Distributing of community resources (e.g., libraries, locations for immunizations and physicals) to enable families to access them during the summer before kindergarten
- Providing home learning activities to families to help them prepare children for kindergarten entry

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Our goal is to increase ELA student proficiency rate to at least 35% from 27% to 35%, with 60% learning gains from 49% to 60%, and 68% lowest 25% gains from 63% to 68%, as determined by FSA by June 2022.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

According to the FY21 FSA results, South Grade had a 5% decline in ELA proficiency, as well as a 6% decline in learning gains as compared to the FY19 FSA results. According to the FY21 FSA results in Math, South Grade had a 17% decline in proficiency, 16% decline in learning gains and 7% decline in lowest 25% gains. In Science, South Grade had a 3% decline compared to FY19 FSA Science results.

The contributing factor is the continued need to support all learners through differentiation of whole group and small group instruction. We need to develop our teachers to utilize instructional differentiation and student collaboration for all content areas. We have a high number of ELL and RTI tiered students who require very specialized instruction to meet student individual needs. We continue to build teacher capacity at South Grade by using a wide range of data sources to include FSQs, USAs, RRR, Unit Assessments, District Diagnostics, and iReady Diagnostics to increase student achievement. As a result, teacher training, planning, support and coaching along with progress monitoring class, grade level and school data will be important to meet our ELA proficiency goals.

When looking at our FY21 Diagnostic Winter Data we were at 27% proficiency aligned to our FY21 FSA ELA proficiency data. This was a 9% decrease from 35% to 27% as compared to the FY20 ELA Diagnostic to the FY21 ELA Diagnostic results.

Measurable Outcome:

Comparing FY21 ELA Diagnostic to FY20 ELA Diagnostic results:
 ELL LY subgroup showed a decrease of 1% from 17% to 16%. Our goal is to increase from 16% to 20%.
 SWD subgroup showed a decrease of 21% from 35% to 14%. Our goal is to increase from 14% to 40%.
 Black subgroup showed a decrease of 7% from 44% to 37%. Our goal is to increase from 37% to 50%.
 Hispanic subgroup showed a decrease of 9% from 33% to 24%. Our goal is to increase from 24% to 38%.
 Our ESSA subgroup demonstrated an increase of 7% from 50% to 57%. Our goal is to increase from 57% to 62%.

Monitoring:

FSQs/USAs/Diagnostics - Ongoing
 Data Chats with teachers every 8 weeks
 Teacher and student data chats
 PLC Sign-in/Lesson Plans/Observations
 PD Sign-in/Lesson Plans/Observations
 Lesson Plans Review
 Classroom Walkthroughs
 Informal/formal observations

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ana Arce Gonzalez (ana.arce-gonzalez@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiated small group instruction using AVID to support rigor, instruction, and collaboration and culture
2. Teacher providing clear and effective learning feedback (i.e., teacher/student data chat including setting up goals and objectives).
3. Using complex text and questions to support student engagement and collaboration.
4. Reciprocal teaching and allowing students to fully engage in their own learning.
5. Professional Development/PLC opportunities - Teachers will engage in professional development every 6 days to ensure collaborative planning and data analysis to strengthen standards-based instruction.
6. Tutorial will be provided to all priority students after school to ensure remediation of standards based lessons.
7. Instructional coaches will support, model and coach teachers and provide job-embedded professional development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Using differentiated instruction through content, process and learning environment would meet the needs of the different learners.
2. Data driven instruction, progress monitoring, and accountability of groups during PLCs will help target the while, black and all students to meet individual needs.
3. In order to increase proficiency the engagement and collaboration among students is directly aligned to high learning outcomes.
4. Data chats ensures students our progress monitoring their own learning and allow teachers and students to make changes and decisions toward future goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership Team and PD Team:

1. Deliverable professional development to include differentiated instruction (i.e., small group instruction, strategy/skill/oral/phonics/word work) and AVID strategies. PD will focus on instructional needs.

Administration:

2. Identified students with reading deficiency(ies) will receive SAI, RTI, LLI remediation/intervention support. Schedules will be created to allow for tiered support services.

Instructional Coaches/SSCC:

3. During PLC, teachers and coaches will analyze data to include next steps to allow for more effective outcomes. Putting in place the right services and catching deficiencies at an early stage will create a more continuous best practice.

Care Team/Guidance Counselors/Administration:

4. Throughout the school year, SEL is being supported by Morning Meeting Implementation and on-site mental health team to deliver school-wide positive behavior systems (i.e., PBS/Safety Committee meets monthly to ensure progress monitoring of systems and problem/solution interventions)

Administration/Instructional Coaches:

5. Tutorial will be implemented twice a week after school. Instructional coaches will create scope and sequence calendar to align with data supported area of need. Students will be selected and grouped based on iReady, FY22 Diagnostic results, FSQs, and USA data. Students will rotate among content experts.

Teachers:

6. Stay at home tutorial will be implemented online through Google Meet for students who have been quarantined, as to provide uninterrupted academic support.

Teachers:

7. Implement AVID collaborative structures daily to support all students.

Person Responsible Loris Barr (loris.barr@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.

South Grade Elementary falls in the very low category when compared to all elementary school statewide (reported 0.1 incidents per 100 students).

South Grade plans to continue our SWPB supports by encouraging students' academic and behavioral success. We will continue to integrate a Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines during school assemblies and morning news. These expectations are communicated with parents and stakeholders who are directly involved with our schools initiatives. We will continue to embrace FAU social work interns who support our students and families with issues to foster a better positive relationship between school and home.

School Counselors teach tier one proactive lessons to all students K-5. These lessons vary from various SEL topics (self-management, self-awareness, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making) to explicit preventive safety lessons. Students will continue to learn how to be aware of unsafe situations or "red flags" and how to inform safe adults. These lessons will be continued in a proactive approach to continue teaching students the skills they need to foster a safe and welcoming environment. Additionally, students will also continue to receive tier 2 (small group) and tier 3 (individual) support as needed.

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.

School-wide Positive Behavior is used to encourage students' academic and behavioral success. To celebrate that success students may choose from a list of rewards which includes choices like lunch with the teacher, classroom scavenger hunt, choose the look of the teacher's bitmoji, etc. Certificates, individual

punch cards and incentives will be offered campus wide as a way to reward good choices. To highlight teachers' contributions to students' success, the School-wide Positive Behavior Team will provide incentives to teachers and non-instructional staff throughout the year for their participation of acknowledging students.

South Grade Elementary is very supportive with assisting parents at school and/or in the home. Office staff and teachers make daily/weekly home visits with providing parents student academic assistance. As well, we monitor attendance closely and weekly, conduct home visits to encourage students to attend school. Students are recognized weekly for perfect attendance. Any attendance concerns are addressed with the school-based team that meets weekly. When appropriate, the attendance clerk meets with the parent and creates a plan of action (contract) on how to best resolve the attendance concern.

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. This will be taught through the school's SEL classes that will be on a rotation. In addition, the morning announcements will emphasize the character development focus for the month on a daily basis.

Students at South Grade Elementary are given the opportunity to learn college and career readiness skills in 4th and 5th grade. This program teaches students how to be more organized, how to take notes, shows them study skills, helps build relational capacity, sets high expectations, allows students to collaborate, ask and answer inquiry type questions, and fosters a safe environment for students. Elementary students develop the academic habits they will need to be successful in middle school, high school, and college, in an age-appropriate and challenging way.

With the additional support of student mental health interns, we are able to provide students the social/emotional support needed to cope with daily life circumstances. We have a play therapy room that has been designed to help students feel comfortable as they work on strategies to support social/emotional concerns. The toys and materials in the therapy room have an effect on the type and amount of expression and interaction with the therapist.

In addition, as stipulated within Florida Statute & Policy 2.09 South Grade Elementary ensures all students receive equal access to the pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing 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, 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".

(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.

(c) Women's Contribution

(d) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

These concepts are introduced as stand-alone and may also be integrated into other core subjects. 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.

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

Administration:

Promote and establish trust, set clear expectations and goals, give feedback and recognize good work. Creates environment where teachers can share best practices.

School Counselors/BHP/Co-Located Behavioral Specialist:

School counselors demonstrate cultural responsiveness by collaborating with all stakeholder to create a school and community climate that embraces cultural diversity and helps to promote the academic, career and social/emotional success for all students.

Teachers/Staff/Non-Instructional:

Teachers help develop student skills and encourage a positive school culture by giving them the ability to improve their craft.

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 |
|---|----------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 2431 - South Grade Elementary School | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: N/A</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$0.00 |