

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Roosevelt Middle School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Roosevelt Middle School

1900 N AUSTRALIAN AVE, West Palm Beach, FL 33407

<https://rms.palmbeachschools.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Jeremiah Stewart**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (49%)<br>2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Roosevelt Middle School

1900 N AUSTRALIAN AVE, West Palm Beach, FL 33407

<https://rms.palmbeachschools.org>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 99%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       |         | C       | 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.**

We aim to broaden our students' awareness of the college and career pathways that are aligned with our choice programs and provide structures and opportunities that will strengthen their knowledge and preparation. This will prepare our students for high school through our academic curricula and additional accelerated learning. With the collaborative support of staff, parents and community, each student will be provided with a succession plan for continuous educational growth and development.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Roosevelt Community Middle School is to nurture, inspire and empower a generation of innovative thinkers, creative problem solvers, and aspiring leaders who are prepared to excel in college and lead in careers.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name                | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Stewart, Jeremiah   | Principal           | The principal provides the overall school vision for achieving academic and social goals. The principal utilizes the FCIM Model to monitor the progress in meeting the goals. The principal meets frequently with assistant principals, academic coaches, and other instructional leaders to review progress and make instructional decisions to enhance student achievement.   |
| Jones, Lori         | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal is responsible for their respective grade level. This included all content areas and discipline. The assistant principal works closely with each department instructional leader to ensure that standards-based instruction provides ongoing support to the departments to ensure data-based decisions are the focus for instructional practices within the content.  |
| Pettiford, Kimberly | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal is responsible for their respective grade level. This included all content areas and discipline. The assistant principal works closely with each department instructional leader to ensure that standards-based instruction provides ongoing support to the departments to ensure data-based decisions are the focus for instructional practices within the content.  |
| Rolle, Samuel       | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal is responsible for their respective grade level. This included all content areas and discipline. The assistant principal works closely with each department instructional leader to ensure that standards-based instruction provides ongoing support to the departments to ensure data-based decisions are the focus for instructional practices within the content.  |
| Potenza, Mia        | Other               | The SSCC supports the administration and provides professional development to the instructional staff. This includes whole group PD and PD on an as-needed basis based on observations by the administration. The SSCC leads the PLCs for the math department and provides support during PLCs for all other departments.   |
| Kelly, Mercia       | Reading Coach       | The instructional coach works with the leadership team, instructional leaders and classroom teachers to evaluate school core content. With support for the school leaders, the instructional coach designs instructional routines, standards-based assessments and classroom interventions for each content area. The instructional coach also works with district personnel for support in meeting the academic needs of the whole school. The instructional coach analyzes grade level/content data and provides professional development in evidence-based strategies to increase student achievement. |
| Fletcher, Robert    | Science Coach       | The instructional coach works with the leadership team, instructional leaders and classroom teachers to evaluate school core content. With support for the school leaders, the instructional coach designs instructional routines, standards-based assessments and classroom interventions for each content area. The instructional coach also works with district personnel for support in meeting the academic needs of the whole school. The instructional coach analyzes grade  |



| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---------------------------------|
|------|----------------|---------------------------------|

level/content data and provides professional development in evidence-based strategies to increase student achievement.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/18/2018, Jeremiah Stewart

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

12

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

71

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

835

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

5

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

5

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 280 | 256 | 300 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 836   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78  | 28  | 47  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 153   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32  | 52  | 43  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 127   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42  | 47  | 58  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 147   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17  | 8   | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 81    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85  | 96  | 116 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 297   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93  | 80  | 118 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 291   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97  | 105 | 118 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 320   |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 81 | 99 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 303   |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| 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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 | 351 | 330 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 954   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78  | 26  | 24  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 128   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 13  | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 96  | 116 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 361   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 57  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 209   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77  | 97  | 113 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 287   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 44  | 59  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 141   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196 | 191 | 153 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 540   |
| FY21 ELA Diag Levels 1 & 2                               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 117 | 85  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 303   |
| FY21 Math Diag Levels 1 & 2                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 127 | 132 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 394   |

**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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 77 | 76 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 290   |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**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                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 | 351 | 330 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 954   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78  | 26  | 24  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 128   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 13  | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 96  | 116 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 361   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 57  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 209   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77  | 97  | 113 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 287   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 44  | 59  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 141   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196 | 191 | 153 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 540   |
| FY21 ELA Diag Levels 1 & 2                               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 117 | 85  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 303   |
| FY21 Math Diag Levels 1 & 2                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 127 | 132 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 394   |

#### 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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 77 | 76 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 290   |

#### 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

## 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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 36%    | 53%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 44%    | 58%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 44%    |          |       |        |          |       | 50%    | 56%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 41%    |          |       |        |          |       | 41%    | 49%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 43%    | 35%      | 36%   |        |          |       | 55%    | 62%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 61%    |          |       |        |          |       | 55%    | 60%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 53%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 30%    | 56%      | 53%   |        |          |       | 31%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 46%    | 64%      | 58%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 75%      | 72%   |

**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 |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 45%    | 58%      | -13%                       | 54%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 40%    | 53%      | -13%                       | 52%   | -12%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -45%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 44%    | 58%      | -14%                       | 56%   | -12%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -40%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 59%    | 60%      | -1%                        | 55%   | 4%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 9%     | 35%      | -26%                       | 54%   | -45%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -59%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 55%    | 64%      | -9%                        | 46%   | 9%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 30%    | 51%      | -21%                       | 48%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 54%    | 72%      | -18%                  | 71%   | -17%               |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 85%    | 64%      | 21%                   | 61%   | 24%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 100%   | 60%      | 40%                   | 57%   | 43%                |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 11       | 39     | 43          | 19        | 46      | 52           | 9        | 18      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 24       | 39     | 42          | 36        | 59      | 50           | 16       | 36      | 74        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 82       | 65     |             | 94        | 88      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 42     | 40          | 37        | 57      | 60           | 27       | 44      | 84        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 37       | 46     | 43          | 50        | 65      | 52           | 33       | 47      | 76        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 38       | 40     |             | 50        | 77      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 46       | 50     |             | 54        | 100     |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 35       | 44     | 41          | 42        | 61      | 60           | 29       | 45      | 84        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 9        | 18     | 17          | 14        | 18      | 19           | 11       | 8       | 40        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 35       | 40     | 34          | 34        | 22      | 10           | 12       | 32      | 62        |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| ASN                                       | 79       | 71     |             | 71        | 43      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 35       | 33     | 25          | 27        | 18      | 21           | 23       | 31      | 59        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 44       | 42     | 28          | 40        | 23      | 9            | 29       | 42      | 72        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 67       | 53     |             | 57        | 21      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 47       | 43     |             | 40        | 29      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 36     | 26          | 31        | 19      | 18           | 25       | 35      | 62        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 16       | 39     | 34          | 28        | 46      | 38           | 8        | 30      | 71        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 34       | 43     | 42          | 51        | 57      | 47           | 16       | 40      | 79        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 86       | 93     |             | 100       | 92      |              |          |         | 87        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 44       | 48     | 41          | 52        | 53      | 48           | 28       | 55      | 80        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 44       | 52     | 44          | 61        | 61      | 51           | 35       | 55      | 80        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 43       | 50     |             | 57        | 43      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 63       | 65     |             | 73        | 63      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 42       | 47     | 40          | 53        | 54      | 48           | 28       | 53      | 79        |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 50   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 57   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 500  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 98%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 31   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 1    |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 43  |
| 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   | 82  |
| 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                                | 46  |
| 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  | 51  |
| 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   | 51  |
| 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   | 63  |
| 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                                | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?

From 2021 to 2022, all of our school grade components increased with the exception of ELA achievement which dropped from 39% to 36%. Overall our largest gains were in math with an 11% increase in proficiency, 41% increase in Learning Gains and 40% increase in our Lowest 25%. The only ESSA subgroup that does not meet the 41% target is our Students with Disabilities. Last year that category also included English Language Learners, Black/African American Students, Hispanic Students, White Students and Economically Disadvantaged Students. Our ELL students dropped in ELA from 35% proficiency to 24%. Our ELL proficiency in math went up 2% overall and increased 37% in learning gains.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest need for improvement is overall our students with disabilities. Our SWD only had an 11% proficiency in ELA, 19% in math, 9% in science and 18% in social studies. There was some improvement from 2021, with our SWD having 39% learning gains in ELA and 46% learning gains in math.

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

Due to Covid and distance learning, our students with disabilities overall took the biggest hit. During this time, these students were not able to get the individualized instruction they needed because they were not face to face with their general education and support teachers. With 2022 being the first full school year, our proficiency for these students rose slightly. However, there is still a high need for improvement. To best support these students, we will be providing professional development for our teachers on small group instruction. This PD will focus on how to effectively implement small group instruction as well as analyzing data for identifying which students need the additional support. We will also provide targeted after school tutorial for these students on specific standards of weakness.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Seventh grade math showed the most improvement by far. The only students that take the seventh grade math assessment are the level one and two students. The level three, four and five students take eighth grade math and the eighth grade test at the end of the year. This typically causes the seventh grade math proficiency to be very low. In 2022, our seventh grade math proficiency was 20%, which is the highest it has ever been. Overall, our math learning gains showed the most improvement from 20% to 61%.

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

Our seventh grade math teachers focused more on individualized support and making math class "fun" through interactive games and activities in class. The student engagement increased as well as the tutorial attendance. Due to Covid and distance learning, our math scores dropped the most during the 2021 school year. This year we focused on filling in the foundational gaps and learning loss which caused the high increase in learning gains. Our math teachers planned collaboratively to be able to teach the grade level standards while also reteaching the standards from the past two years that the students were struggling with.

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

We will use iXL, Kessler Science, Penda, Commonlit, Successmaker and ALL in Learning online learning platforms. These online platforms allow the students to practice the current standards they are on while also providing individualized learning plans to fill any gaps they may have. All for One learning is an assessment platform that allows the teachers to make common assessments and get real time data from their students. This platform also mimics the rigor and question types that the students will see on the FSA so they will be very familiar and confident once it becomes testing time. In addition to technology, small group instruction will allow teachers to meet with all groups of students and provide them what they need whether its is remediation or elaboration.

**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.**

Our professional development this year will focus on small group instruction. It will take part in numerous sessions throughout the year. Components will include data analysis to identifying students, small group instruction models, remediation practices and classroom management during small group.

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

We will start our tutorial program early this school year to provide extra support for our students. Tutorial will be available after school and during lunch for those students who cannot stay late. Through the use of our online programs, our students will be able to build their skills in each content area throughout their three years in middle school. Our teachers are being trained on collaborative study groups which is an AVID strategy they will use this year as well as in the future.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

With the new B.E.S.T. standards, our students and teachers will have to adjust to the new expectations, curriculum and assessment calendar. To provide our teachers with the necessary support, our instructional support staff (SSCC, coaches and LTF) will conduct ongoing professional development through PLCs of the new standards in ELA and Math. In addition to the new standards, our goal is to include more hands on instruction, primarily in science and choice programs, to further their understanding of the standards. This instruction may include additional labs or field trips to meet the fullest extent of the standards. Our students with disabilities are the only ESSA subgroup that has a Federal Index score below the target of 41% proficiency. Our SWD overall Federal Index score for the 2021-2022 school year was 31%. Overall, our SWD were only 11% proficient in ELA, 19% in Math, 9% in science and 18% in social studies. Based on these results, we will be focusing on supporting these students more in class through standards aligned, small group instruction. Teachers will be provided professional development on effective implementation of small group instruction and the academic support team will provide push in services to pull small groups of students who need additional support with the material. Students with Disabilities will be provided direct instruction tutorial specifically to meet their needs in the classroom. The ESE teachers will work directly with the general education teachers to identify the students in need of additional support through tutorial and the exact standards they need assistance with.

**Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

SWD ELA Achievement: 15%  
 SWD ELA Learning Gains: 43%  
 SWD Math Achievement: 24%  
 SWD Math Learning Gains: 50%  
 SWD Science Achievement: 14%  
 SWD Civics Achievement: 22%

**Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

School, district and state created assessments will be administered to students to monitor the progress of each student on every standard. During PLCs, our teachers will analyze the data from these assessments and break it down by subgroup, specifically focusing on SWD to identify standards of strength and those that need to be retaught in a small group setting. Administrators and coaches will perform weekly walk throughs to ensure lessons are standards based and teachers are utilizing the small group practices taught during professional development. The SSCC, LTF and coaches will provide more individualized support for those teachers identified as struggling with small groups.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jeremiah Stewart (jeremiah.stewart@palmbeachschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Differentiated small group instruction to support all students, specifically SWD
2. Targeted after school tutorial to meet the individual needs of all students
3. Adaptive technology

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

4. AVID (Focus Note-taking, reading strategies, organization)
5. PBS to reward students for positive behavior and performance
6. Intensive math and reading class to provide additional support
7. Labs and Field Trips
8. Professional Development of B.E.S.T. standards

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

1. Small group instruction allows the teacher to pull specific groups of students that need support on a specific standards, these groups change on a daily basis based on individual student need
2. Targeted after school tutorial ensures students needs are being met beyond the classroom
3. Adaptive Technology to provide individualized support and fill in academic gaps in math, ELA and science
4. AVID schoolwide teaches students how to take and use notes, as well as strong organizational skills
5. PBS encourages students to perform at their highest ability and rewards students for proficiency and growth
6. Intensive math and reading classes allows the teacher to provide more foundational support in their content area
7. Through labs and field trips students will be given more hands on experiences to deepen their knowledge and connection to the standards being taught in class.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

**Small Group Instruction**

- provide all teachers and support staff with training on effective implementation of small group instruction
- conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation
- communicate with academic support team when teachers need assistance

**Person**

**Responsible** Jeremiah Stewart (jeremiah.stewart@palmbeachschools.org)

**Targeted After School Tutorial**

- select content expert teachers based on data
- work collaboratively with ESE and general education teachers to identify students that are in need of extra support on upcoming tutorial standard
- track and monitor student progress after tutorial

**Person**

**Responsible** Mia Potenza (mia.potenza@palmbeachschools.org)

**Adaptive Technology**

- ALL in Learning will be used to create and administer common assessments, then analyzed during PLCs
- Successmaker will be used in all intensive math classes to provide individualized support and fill foundational gaps
- Commonlit will be used in all intensive reading class to provide intensive reading classes an online program for practice utilizing the BEST standards and applying the reading strategies taught in class

**Person**

**Responsible** Mia Potenza (mia.potenza@palmbeachschools.org)

#### AVID

- implement school-wide use of the AVID binder to teach organization skills to all students
- incorporate content specific AVID strategies in each subject area

**Person Responsible** Robert Fletcher (robert.fletcher@palmbeachschools.org)

#### PBS

- Velt Bucks will be given to students who are showing any aspect of PRIDE
- Velt Bucks will be able to be redeemed for various snacks or incentives

**Person Responsible** Mia Potenza (mia.potenza@palmbeachschools.org)

#### Field Trips/Labs

- Standards-based hands on activities and labs to deepend knowledge and connection of the standards

**Person Responsible** Robert Fletcher (robert.fletcher@palmbeachschools.org)

#### Professional Development of B.E.S.T. standards

**Person Responsible** Shalanda Lester (shalanda.lester@palmbeachschools.org)

### 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

#### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

**Parent Podcast:** The leadership team will be conducting a weekly online Parent Podcast through Youtube Live to communicate with all stakeholders different events that are happening at Roosevelt. The instructional coaches will be providing weekly tips and tricks to help parents help their child. These tips will focus on the various online platforms that our students use on a daily basis and how the parents can check their child's work.

**PTSA/SAC:** The PTSA and SAC allow various stakeholders to be involved with on campus decisions and support school initiatives.

**Choice Open House:** Upcoming, future Roosevelt students and families can explore and learn more about the different magnet programs that we offer and how they can apply for them.

**Science Night:** Science Night allows students and parents to explore different STEM activities to enhance the science curriculum.

**Curriculum Night:** Stakeholders are provided with information from the instructional coaches on ways to prepare our students to be successful in their content FSA and NGSS testing.

**AVID:** AVID creates a school culture that is focused on our students becoming college-ready and having the conversations about what it takes to go to college. Our students will participate in college spirit days, college projects, college bulletin boards, and college presentations.

PBS: Students are rewarded for positive behaviors which creates a positive school culture.

Teachers will give students "Velt Bucks" when they are doing something that represents PRIDE. The students will be able to cash in Velt Bucks on certain days during lunch for various prizes/incentives.

Social-Emotional Learning: All teachers are required to complete a social/emotional check or activity at the beginning of the class period to ensure that all students' needs are being met.

Guidance counselors and the mental health behavior specialist provide services for any student who might need more assistance

Culture of Diversity: 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 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas.

To appreciate the diversity on our campus, our students will be provided opportunities to share their cultures through Hispanic Heritage and Black History months. During these months, students will create projects on important people from those cultures and the impact that they had. Students will be provided reading and writing prompts using Commonlit that highlight important people and customs of various cultures.

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

Mrs. Potenza is our Single School Culture Coordinator and PBS Internal Coach. Through both roles, her responsibility is to create and promote positive school culture and environment. The Velt Bucks system is in place to empower all staff members (both instructional and non-instructional) to reward students for demonstrating the positive behaviors that are outlined in our PBS matrix and universal guidelines. Mrs. Potenza is in charge of overseeing the Velt Bucks program and its fidelity.

Our administration is responsible for promoting and ensuring a safe environment for the students and staff. They do this by constantly being visible on campus, ensuring all doors in their assigned area are locked and immediately handling any incidents on campus.

Our staff is responsible for promoting a positive culture by following the Velt Bucks system and encouraging a positive environment in all areas of campus.

The families of our students are responsible for ensuring that any homework is completed and the students know they are held to high expectations at school and home.