

The School District of Palm Beach County

Hidden Oaks K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Hidden Oaks K 8

7685 S MILITARY TRL, Lake Worth, FL 33463

<https://hok8.palmbeachschools.org/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/18/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Hidden Oaks K-8 School is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hidden Oaks K-8 School envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, where all learners reach their highest potential and are provided tools to succeed in the global economy.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bremekamp, Shari	Principal	<p>As the principal of Hidden Oaks K-8 school, the principal manages and supervises all aspects of the educational program. First and foremost the principal is responsible for the instructional delivery for all students. The principal is the decision maker in regards to the master schedule, the teacher evaluation and supervision, curriculum council, Palm Beach Model of Instruction, professional development, professional learning community coordinator, hiring new teachers and school improvement activities. The principal also manages and supervises the business side of the school. The principal is responsible for all budgetary decisions and contracts. Additionally responsibilities listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Deliberate practice for all instructional staff * Discipline referral monitor * Employee Building Council * School Advisory Council * School Safety * School/ Community Facilitate
White, Bryan	Assistant Principal	<p>As the assistant principal of Hidden Oaks K-8 school, Mr. White manages and supervises all aspects of the educational program. Mr. White is responsible for the instructional delivery for all students and works with the principal as the decision maker in regards to the master schedule, the teacher evaluation and supervision, curriculum council, Palm Beach Model of Instruction, professional development, professional learning community coordinator, hiring new teachers and school improvement activities. Additionally responsibilities listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Deliberate practice for all instructional staff * Discipline referral monitor * School Safety * School/ Community Facilitate * Implementation of STEAM Program * Works Collaboratively with staff and community stakeholders with the development of the SIP * Serves as the Point of Contact for the District Accreditation * Oversees and supports non-instructional staff (Assistant Behavior Needs Paraprofessionals, Custodial Staff)
Kramer, Michele	Other	<p>The SSCC supports teachers in building their capacity in planning and delivering rigorous standards based instruction, monitors student data, identifies students in need of intervention and plans and facilitates small group instruction. The SSCC also facilitates 4th and 5th grade PLCs to focus on rigorous standards based instruction and curriculum. The SSCC also coordinates with local public service organizations and business partners to provide support and resources for families. Monitor attendance and scheduled interventions for students who have not increased their academic proficiency.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jackson, Kristina	Dean	As the dean of students Ms. Jackson works with the safety and instructional aspects of the school. * Choice Program Coordinator * SAC Chairperson * Works with student discipline * Coaches & mentors teachers * Coaches and mentors students * MSCR Coordinator * 504 Contact
Benson, Jessica	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Fedena, Gina	Teacher, ESE	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

SAC meetings will be held the first Tuesday of each month to involve key stakeholders including teachers, administrators, parents, and community members. During these meetings, collected data will be analyzed and discussed to create our goals for the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored for effective implementation by tracking progress towards our goals. These metrics will include standardized test scores, attendance rates, and any other relevant academic and behavioral indicators. Data will be collected and disaggregated to highlight differences in performance among different student groups, particularly those with achievement gaps. Formative and summative assessment data will be utilized to assess the effectiveness of instructional strategies and interventions. During our SAC meetings we will discuss data collected to measure progress towards the SIP goal. Areas where improvement is needed and potential adjustments to the plan will be identified during these SAC meetings. Teachers and administrators will work together during PLCs to identify the diverse needs of the student population.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	33	24	28	21	20	29	3	6	4	168
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	2	0	1	0	4	1	11
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	2	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	22	11	43
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	22	20	12	6	5	98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	17	37	2	5	1	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	53	25	58	0	0	0	136
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	24	13	28	45	30	39	9	16	7	211

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	19	23	22	20	18	9	4	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3	2	11
Course failure in ELA	0	6	27	33	30	38	2	0	0	136
Course failure in Math	0	4	15	28	26	13	3	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	13	16	11	6	3	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	18	17	7	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	13	20	22	15	12	4	86

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	17	27	28	27	12	4	2	123

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	13	1	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	19	23	22	20	18	9	4	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3	2	11
Course failure in ELA	0	6	27	33	30	38	2	0	0	136
Course failure in Math	0	4	15	28	26	13	3	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	13	16	11	6	3	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	18	17	7	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	13	20	22	15	12	4	86

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	17	27	28	27	12	4	2	123

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	13	1	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	49	53	61	52	55	54		
ELA Learning Gains				66			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			47		
Math Achievement*	68	51	55	61	45	42	43		
Math Learning Gains				72			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72			35		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	57	46	52	46	48	54	40		
Social Studies Achievement*	85	63	68	87	57	59	73		
Middle School Acceleration	78	68	70	89	51	51	69		
Graduation Rate		73	74		38	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		62	70			
ELP Progress	46	53	55	53	64	70	35		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	655
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	59			
HSP	62			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	59			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	60			
BLK	58			
HSP	65			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	61			68			57	85	78			46
SWD	32			45			24	73	70		7	28
ELL	48			56			43				5	46
AMI												
ASN	63			80							2	
BLK	55			61			46	86	73		7	43
HSP	57			68			53	73	71		7	47
MUL	79			71							2	
PAC												
WHT	69			75			69	92	81		6	
FRL	54			63			55	73	69		7	46

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	66	48	61	72	72	46	87	89			53
SWD	32	43	29	39	59	50	39					44
ELL	44	57	46	44	60	52	25					53
AMI												
ASN	47	81		68	81		25					
BLK	57	61	45	54	66	55	36	79	86			36
HSP	64	66	57	60	71	87	42	80				61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65	71	25	67	81	100	69	100	88			
FRL	55	64	49	54	68	68	37	86	86			51

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	58	47	43	32	35	40	73	69			35
SWD	30	53	53	29	36	65	19	70				29
ELL	39	66	50	22	25	27	8					35

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	55			43	40							23
BLK	49	53	21	33	23	26	38	81	73			44
HSP	46	59	56	42	27	20	38	54	62			32
MUL	38	33		50	58		30					
PAC												
WHT	69	70	77	56	42	60	42	92	65			
FRL	46	52	48	36	25	30	31	73	69			36

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	56%	6%	54%	8%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	48%	7%	47%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	47%	17%	47%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
06	2023 - Spring	66%	45%	21%	47%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	48%	10%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	86%	54%	32%	54%	32%
07	2023 - Spring	56%	36%	20%	48%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	57%	-1%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	52%	18%	61%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	94%	65%	29%	55%	39%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	56%	4%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	83%	46%	37%	44%	39%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	51%	-5%	51%	-5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	50%	*

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	65%	21%	66%	20%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the Student with Disabilities across all subject areas. The Students with Disabilities showed 32% proficiency in ELA, 39% proficiency in Math, and 39% proficiency in science. As a school, we noticed that our ESE self-contained classrooms did not show growth across multiple years. A contributing factor is that the classroom had multiple grade levels of students that were tested on the FAST.

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

As a school, we did not have any components where there was a large decline. The data component that did not increase was our ELA Lowest 25% students. Our lowest 25% student in ELA went from 47% to 45% proficiency. Many of our lowest 25% students are our students with disabilities, ELL students, and students who are going through the Response to Intervention process.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when being compared to the state average is our Science scores. As a school, we had 53% of our students below proficiency on the Science assessment. The state had 47% below proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our Math scores overall. Our Math proficiency increased from 43% to 61%. In the area of Math, the students received more small group instruction. In the classrooms, more resources were used to target the student's resources. Also, there was more remediation provided in the classroom.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

When reflecting on the data, two potential areas of concern are children with absences as well as course failure in ELA.

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

A priority for school improvement is our Science scores. 46% of our students showed proficiency on the Science assessment. We will be doing more project based learning as well as utilizing science journals. Another priority is to increase our ELA scores, especially with our lowest 25% students, which dropped from 47% to 45% proficient. We will continue to provide small group instruction as well as identify students who need to go through the School Based Team process. Another priority is to better monitor students who have absences of 10% or more days. We had 168 students who had 10% or more days absent during the school year. We will be completing truancy packets for these students and monitoring them through the School Based Team process.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

When looking at the data we see that we have a lot of things to be proud of. However, as a school aligned to the District's Strategic Plan, we want to ensure all students engage in teaching and learning that results in academic excellence. Our instructional priority is delivering content, concept, or skill that is aligned to the benchmark and intended learning. Our school has demonstrated significant growth in all content areas except science. The data shows significant growth in ELA, except for our lowest 25% students. The data shows that there is a need for growth in third grade ELA proficiency and our lowest 25%. Our science scores for grades 5 have not increased over the years. Our 8th grade science students did very well on the science assessment. Although we showed improvement in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities, they are currently at 73% of these students who are performing below grade level in the area of ELA in grades 3-8, indicating a need for targeted instructional practices. In turn, we also want to provide opportunity for enrichment. The Cambridge courses will provide coverage of required standards with a more global approach. Our plan is to begin the implementation of global perspectives this school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

February 2024 May 2024

Student Learning Outcomes 3% growth in all content areas 5% growth in all content areas

Teaching Practice Outcome

By February of 2024, 50% of our teachers will effectively utilize the Gradual Release Model of Instruction.

By May of 2024, 75% of our teachers will effectively utilize the Gradual Release Model of Instruction

Monitoring:

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

Science proficiency will be monitored by administration along with the leadership team to ensure the following is taking place. Small group instruction, Close reading strategies, the use of the school based resources (science journals, Flocabulary). The leadership team will monitor this by reviewing the instructional focus calendars, conducting walkthroughs with actionable feedback, student and teacher data chats. Teachers will also have the opportunity to receive additional professional development. In the area of math, the leadership will be attending PLC's, monitoring use of math resources provided by the South Area Title I Math Team. The leadership team will also closely monitor instructional focus calendars and conduct teacher data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shari Bremekamp (shari.bremekamp@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Differentiated Small Group instruction

Use of school based resources and teachers to attend Professional Development

Use of science journals and provide training to teachers

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated Small Group instruction - being able to provide targeted instruction especially to those students who are not currently on grade level. This will also give the teacher the opportunity to remediate information from prior grade levels.

School Based Resources - teachers will have access to additional resources to supplement their instruction

Science journals and Professional Development - provides resources to students to increase their understanding of concepts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Monitor small group instruction through walk-throughs with actionable feedback.

Person Responsible: Shari Bremekamp (shari.bremekamp@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Every 9 weeks

Providing school based resources, such as Hands-On Science, Flocabulary, Science journals

Person Responsible: Shari Bremekamp (shari.bremekamp@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: As needed

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In addition, as stipulated within Florida Statute & Policy 2.09 and in alignment to the District's Strategic plan our school ensures all students receive equal access to the pillars of Effective Instruction: Students immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42.

Continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 Instruction applicable to appropriate grade levels including but not limited to:

- (g) History of Holocaust
- (h) History of Africans and African Americans
- (i) History of Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders
- (o) Health Education, Life Skills & Social Media
- (q) Hispanic Contributions
- (r) Women's Contributions
- (t) Civic & Character Education
- (u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the school, 100% of our students who are in the appropriate grade levels will be immersed in rigorous tasks that encompass the full intent of the Florida State standards and content required by the Florida State Statute 1003.42.

Monitoring:

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

Evidence will be submitted by instructional staff to show that instruction was given to the appropriate students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shari Bremekamp (shari.bremekamp@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teams will develop plans for instruction on the topics listed above.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Florida State Statute states that this instruction is mandatory for all students based on the appropriate levels.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Evidence will be collected to ensure that the topics listed above were taught during the school to the appropriate students.

Person Responsible: Shari Bremekamp (shari.bremekamp@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: End of the school year.

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus