Calusa Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Calusa Elementary School

2051 CLINT MOORE RD, Boca Raton, FL 33496

https://cale.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Susan Figueroa

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	30%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (77%)
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	N/A

> * 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

Calusa Elementary School

2051 CLINT MOORE RD, Boca Raton, FL 33496

https://cale.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	19%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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
Calusa Elementary is committed to providing highly trained professional educators, partnering with parents and community to offer a world class education where the most innovating, researched based instructional practices are utilized: together we will ensure that each student has the opportunity to reach their highest potential, developing skills and ethics to become responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision
The Calusa Elementary School stakeholders believe that by establishing a climate of respect and responsibility within a framework of a solid academic program, our students will be prepared for the future.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Green, Lindsy	Teacher, ESE	Monitor student reading performance, Case Manager for SBT, interventions for low 25% and grade 3 readers.
Wotton, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Leadership, Observations, monitor performance, set goals, analyze data, low 25% interventions, parent communication
Gordon, Chari	Teacher, ESE	Monitor student performance, ESE coordinator, SBT & monitor interventions for low 25%
Rivelli-Schreiber, Dianne	Principal	Leadership, Observations, monitor performance, set goals, analyze data, low 25% interventions, parent communication
Thornberry, Carrie	School Counselor	Monitor student performance, SBT coordinator, School Counselor & monitor, 504, interventions for low 25%
Scharf, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student reading performance.
LeClair, Meryn	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student reading performance and interventions for low 25%.
Chirico, Brittanie	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student reading performance and interventions for low 25%.
Fisher, Charlie	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chairperson, Monitor student performance, interventions for low 25%
Griffith, Dana	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student reading performance, interventions for low 25% and grade 3 readers.
Curra, GraceMarie	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student performance, interventions for low 25%
Burton, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student performance, SBT coordinator, ESOL support & monitor, ACCESS, interventions for low 25%
Schwarz, Kara	Assistant Principal	Leadership, Observations, monitor performance, set goals, analyze data, low 25% interventions, parent communication

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Susan Figueroa

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.*

12

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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

91

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	30%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (77%)
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	167	215	195	192	195	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1171
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	8	6	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	31	23	30	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Course failure in Math	0	1	8	10	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	33	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	24	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	8	11	10	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 9/4/2020

Prior Year - 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	218	193	192	200	218	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1228
Attendance below 90 percent	15	18	13	11	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	20	32	41	41	42	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	7	7	6	18	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	218	193	192	200	218	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1228
Attendance below 90 percent	15	18	13	11	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	20	32	41	41	42	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	7	7	6	18	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	84%	58%	57%	81%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	80%	63%	58%	68%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	56%	53%	57%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	88%	68%	63%	84%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	68%	62%	72%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	59%	51%	67%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	51%	53%	76%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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	2019	77%	54%	23%	58%	19%
	2018	83%	56%	27%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	62%	23%	58%	27%
	2018	79%	58%	21%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	85%	59%	26%	56%	29%
	2018	84%	59%	25%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	65%	20%	62%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	82%	63%	19%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison	3%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	67%	16%	64%	19%
	2018	79%	63%	16%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison	1%					
05	2019	88%	65%	23%	60%	28%
	2018	87%	66%	21%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison	9%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	51%	27%	53%	25%
	2018	78%	56%	22%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	60	67	62	57	61	55	50				
ELL	77	86	82	86	80	79	77				
ASN	100	87		96	87						
BLK	52	78		73	79	77					
HSP	81	84	79	89	76	72	90				
MUL	87	83		81	72		85				
WHT	87	77	71	89	79	70	75				
FRL	76	80	84	80	77	68	75				
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	65	61	60	70	70	63	76				
ELL	70	68	78	78	73	67	63				
ASN	96	90		96	90						
BLK	70	71		64	50						
HSP	83	72	69	83	82	73	84				
MUL	87	56		91	81						
WHT	84	72	69	87	73	65	80				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
FRL	77	75	74	75	73	69	71				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	57	47	36	54	50	43	42				
ELL	55	71	69	64	71	68					
ASN	91	86		100	86						
BLK	69	53		66	84						
HSP	77	67	63	83	70	64	74				
MUL	89	80		95	80						
WHT	83	69	56	85	71	65	76				
FRL	73	59	58	77	69	59	60				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	647
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	61
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	82
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	72
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	82
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	80
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	78
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

When looking at the subgroup data for FY19 our black population has the lowest achievement in ELA Proficiency with a drop of (70-52%) 18% points. The contributing factor was the high mobility of students within this subgroup making attaining a strong reading foundation a challenge. Historically this subgroup has the lowest performance in achievement.

During the midyear we saw this subgroup show a slight increase in ELA proficiency with 56%, as reflected on the FY20 Winter Diagnostic, however this is a decline of 7% from FY19 Diagnostic.(63%) End of year FY20 data in iReady window 3 we see our students are increasing in reading proficiency when we compare beginning of the year data (window 1) to end of the year results (window 3).

Additionally, although not our lowest performing subgroup, the SWD subgroup showed declines in ELA Proficiency (65-60%) and math proficiency(70-57%), learning gains(70-61%), and low 25%(63-55%). This is cause for concern as it impacts multiple categories and subgroups. With our students taking FSA in 5th grade it is imperative to monitor this subgroup. The reason is the RTi systems of support haven't been consistently monitored and targeted interventions implemented due to teacher turnover and student mobility rates fluctuating.

iReady:3rd-90% (+22 from W1 of 68%), 4th- 77% (+27% from W1 of 50%), 5th-67% (+13% from W1 of 54%).
Due to a lack of data for FY20 because of state mandated school closure (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue one of our FY20 ELA goals for FY21.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

When looking at our grade level data within achievement, our school had a 6% decline in 3rd grade ELA from 2018. We went from 83% to 77%. This was due to a lack of consistent foundational skills in early literacy instruction. In addition, teacher remediation and targeted intervention were also not consistent within grade levels and throughout our school.

Our mid-year FY20 District's Winter Diagnostic for 3rd grade was 83%, an increase of 7% from our FY19 3rd FSA ELA proficiency.
FY20 Winter Diag vs. FY19 Diag
This was also an increase of 4% from our previous FY19 Diagnostic score of 79%.

The reason for this steady increase was an increased focus on target instruction, early intervention and job embedded professional development on Fundations and LLi.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our ELA and Math scores were both above the state average for all grade levels. We have continued to hold steady at 84% proficiency in ELA and increased in Math proficiency going from 85% to 88%. In all grade levels the low 25% and Learning Gains also remained steady over the two year period. This is due to the fact that our teachers received job embedded professional development on creating

standards based performance tasks and increased rigor of lessons.

However within grade levels our 3rd grade ELA went from 83-77% (FY19). When we look at the midyear grade level data 3rd grade was at 83.6% proficiency with 33 students scoring a level 1 or 2 and the previous year in 3rd grade our winter diagnostic reflected 76.14% with 47 students scoring a level 1 or 2. In 4th grade, the % proficient was 86% with 30 students scoring a 1 or 2. This also shows an increase from the prior FY19 Winter diagnostic where 4th grade scored 81.8% and had 36 students scoring a 1 or 2. This shows that we were beginning to show improvements by increasing our proficiency scores in ELA.

The reason for these improvements is consistent and streamlined PLC's where teachers engage in developing standards based lessons and aligning performance tasks to monitor for mastery.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The area that demonstrated the most improvement was 4th grade ELA proficiency rising 6% to 85%. The subgroup showing the most improvement in both reading and math in proficiency, learning gains and low 25 was ELL. (ELA Proficiency=70-77%, Learning Gains=68-86%, Low 25=78-82%/Math Proficiency=78-86, Learning Gains=68-86, Low 25=67-79%)

This increase can be attributed to our teachers received job embedded professional development on creating standards based performance tasks and increased rigor of lessons.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our two areas of concern after reviewing the EWS data are:
Course failure (ND) on report cards. Our grading system is standards-based and when students receive an ND marking there is an indication that mastery is not met. Therefore, it is not likely that our students will be successful with the state grade-level assessment causing an achievement gap. This causes our students to fall behind and not be on track to meet the mastery levels for the grade level thus impacting performance in other grade levels. As this cycle continues students may be retained and their self-esteem and confidence affected as well.
Attendance-Our students who fall below 90% attendance increases reaching a peak in 5th grade. This is impactful because the 5th-grade year is full of many learning targets and state subject area assessments. If students are not in school they miss a lot of important information and it makes it difficult for them to catch up and demonstrate mastery on missed content . There appears to be a correlation between attendance and level 1 & 2 on the state assessments.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

At Calusa Elementary School we focus on student achievement, student learning gains, and overall social-emotional growth. We believe that if the dedicate time to the following priorities we will ensure equitable and equal opportunity for all of the students by positively influencing:
-a clear path to success
-teaching time management and preparedness
-increasing motivation
-measuring progress
-giving focus and purpose
-boosting self-confidence
-providing challenges

1. ESSA subgroups-Our ESSA (black and SWD) subgroups indicate that we need additional support

to help with achievement in all content areas but not limited to mentoring, tutorials, focused teacher planning/collaboration, and professional development to ensure we meet the needs of all of our students in sn equitable and accessible manner.

2. Building Teacher Capacity-During PLC's we will focus on developing effective and relevant instruction by unpacking standards, analyzing data, developing standards-based lessons, using vetted resources and materials provided by our school district, share best practices, participate in the continuous improvement model and incorporate research-based strategies thus impacting 3rd-grade reading proficiency

3. ELA and Math Learning Gains-If we focus on the positive impact to learning gains by ensuring standards-based instruction and effectively use research cased strategies and resources, we will ensure student learning and improved student achievement towards grade level success and continuous improvement for all.

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 in ELA, Math and Science to align with the District's Strategic Plan; LTO #1; Increase reading proficiency and LTO #2; Ensure High School Readiness. Based on state data from FY19 our overall ELA data is 84%. This is the same percent proficient from FY18. When looking at ELA by grade, only third grade decreased (-6%) while fourth grade increase (+6%) and 5th grade increased (+1%). Our learning gains and low 25 also showed increases.(LG;+8%, L25;+7%). Our math proficiency, learning gains and low 25 all showed increases as well (P;+3%, LG;+2%, L25; +3%). Science achievement declined 2%(81-79%). ESSA data shows the subgroup data for FY19 our black population has the lowest achievement in ELA Proficiency with a drop of (70-52%) 18% points and the SWD subgroup showed declines in ELA Proficiency (65-60%) and math proficiency(70-57%), learning gains(70-61%), and low 25%(63-55%). During the midyear we see the black subgroup show a slight increase in ELA proficiency with 56% proficiency as reflected on the FY20 Winter Diagnostic, however this is a decline of 7% from FY19 Winter diagnostic.(63%) and the SWD subgroup continuing to reflect a decrease in ELA proficiency (55-54%) and remained the same in math. End of year FY20 data in iReady window 3 we see our students are increasing in reading proficiency when we compare beginning of the year data (window 1) to end of the year results (window 3). Due to a lack of data for FY20 because of state mandated school closure (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue one of our FY20 goals for FY21.
Measurable Outcome:	Our measurable goals for FY21 will be to increase (+8%) from 77% to 85% scoring level 3 or higher on the 3rd grade ELA 2021 FSA and to increase from 77% (+1) to 78% in the low 25% making learning gains on the ELA 2021 FSA. During the midyear FY20 Winter Diagnostic we scored 86.25% in ELA proficiency and 83% in math both of which we scores comparable to FY19 FSA in ELA and Math. Additionally, 3rd grade ELA proficiency was at 83%. This shows that we are on the right track. During end of year, our students were taught through virtual distance learning. Due to a lack of data for FY20 because of state mandated school closure (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue our FY20 goals for FY21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dianne Rivelli-Schreiber (dianne.rivelli-schreiber@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Data Tracking through technology (Performance Matters, LSI Standards Tracker, iReady) 2. Data Tracking on attendance in Tutorial (AM and PM) 3. Data Tracking through weekly SBT monitoring meetings
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Data-based tracking utilizing various sources of student performance will be based on long, mid, and short term data points. The data will be used for teachers focus on specific benchmarks in tutorial, small groups, iReady toolkit, and assigned extra iReady lessons. 2. Tutorials will provide students with the additional supports for remediation/enrichment as needed and will ensure students receive the additional support for success. 3. Small group instruction based on interventions determined with the SBT provides an

opportunity for teachers to personalize the learning and provide direction instruction to students at varying reading levels.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategy: Adaptive Technology
Rationale: Technology will afford students the opportunity for remediation and enrichment through interaction with the content.
1. Ensure teachers are trained to use PM, LSI and iReady.
2. Develop schedule to ensure all students have equitable access to technology.
3. Teachers will analyze data to make revisions on content focus during small group instruction.
4. Monitor through data analysis, administrative classroom walks and data tracking.

Person Responsible Dianne Rivelli-Schreiber (dianne.rivelli-schreiber@palmbeachschools.org)

Strategy: Tutorial
Rationale: Students are provided with additional standards-based lessons before/after school
1. Identify teachers for tutorial programs
2. Identify students for direct instruction and technology
3. Teachers instruct using standards-based lessons
4. Monitoring will occur through data analysis/tracking, classroom walks.

Person Responsible Dianne Rivelli-Schreiber (dianne.rivelli-schreiber@palmbeachschools.org)

Strategy: School Based Team (SBT)
Rationale: Students identified through SBT are monitored for implementation & fidelity of interventions
1. Teachers/Case Managers are notified of students on list
2. SBT Leaders share process of RtI with staff
3. Weekly meetings are used to monitor student data, progress, interventions.
4. Monitoring will occur through data analysis/tracking, classroom walks

Person Responsible Dianne Rivelli-Schreiber (dianne.rivelli-schreiber@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan and with the goal to increase academic instruction of all students, students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida Standards including the content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42. We also continue to develop a Single School Culture of excellence in Academics, Behavior, and Climate with an appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. Policy 2.09 with a focus on the instruction of the History of the Holocaust, History of African Americans, the contributions of Hispanics and Women to the United States, and the Sacrifices of Veterans in serving their country.
Addressing the Areas of Focus will contribute to the continuous monitoring of proven successful actions and processes, as well as the development of new actions and processes to benefit student achievement. These deliberately designed action steps and processes are research based with a history of success. They share a common theme of impacting student achievement, and the predicted outcomes would not be exclusive to only the Areas of focus. It is anticipated that 3rd grade ELA achievement and ELA achievement for the lowest 25th percentile will demonstrate positive data gains as a result from the action steps developed for both areas of focus, as well.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statue 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, music; our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures. Students build aspects of Social Emotional learning (SEL) while participating in Academic Teaming on components including: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and decision making.
At Calusa, we have a 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. These topics and other SEL considerations are addressed through daily morning meetings. In addition we have student council where students have decision making opportunities and their input is sought and valued. Students receive a listening ear, support from a behavior mental health professional who is on our staff.
We also recognize the value of creating strong partnerships with families. Research shows that a higher

level of parental involvement leads to increased student achievement at all levels, and involved families impact student attendance, performance, social skills, and post-secondary training. We offer Parent Teacher organized events monthly, as well as Parent Universities on a variety of topics.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$12,273.58
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1911 - Calusa Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$12,273.58
			Notes: Tutorial			
					Total:	$12,273.58