

The School District of Palm Beach County

Roosevelt Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 20 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 20 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Roosevelt Middle School

1900 N AUSTRALIAN AVE, West Palm Beach, FL 33407

<https://rms.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.

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, 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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| 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. |
| Pettiford, Kimberly | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal is responsible for their respective grade level. This includes 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 databased 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 databased decisions are the focus for instructional practices within the content. |
| Lester, Shalanda | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal is responsible for their respective grade level. This includes 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 databased decisions are the focus for instructional practices within the content. |

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.

All stakeholders are invited to every School Advisory Council meeting where data is reviewed and participants are asked for input for improvement to incorporate into the SIP. Multiple emails and call outs are conducted before each SAC meeting to invite stakeholders.

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 regularly be reviewed during leadership meetings to compare the desired progress with the most recent assessment data. Based on this information, any necessary changes will be made to best support the students and reach the target goals.

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) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 99% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| 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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 52 | 76 | 197 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 31 | 53 | 146 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 64 | 55 | 162 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 7 | 26 | 73 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 103 | 111 | 325 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 67 | 58 | 181 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 103 | 109 | 316 |

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

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 28 | 47 | 153 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 52 | 43 | 127 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 47 | 58 | 147 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 56 | 81 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 96 | 116 | 297 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 80 | 118 | 291 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 105 | 118 | 320 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 81 | 99 | 303 |

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

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 28 | 47 | 153 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 52 | 43 | 127 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 47 | 58 | 147 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 56 | 81 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 96 | 116 | 297 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 80 | 118 | 291 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 105 | 118 | 320 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 81 | 99 | 303 |

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

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* | 39 | 51 | 49 | 36 | 53 | 50 | 39 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 44 | | | 36 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41 | | | 26 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 53 | 59 | 56 | 43 | 35 | 36 | 32 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 61 | | | 20 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 59 | | | 19 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 25 | 50 | 49 | 30 | 56 | 53 | 25 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 50 | 68 | 68 | 46 | 64 | 58 | 35 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 53 | 76 | 73 | 83 | 52 | 49 | 64 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 50 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 70 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 38 | 37 | 40 | 57 | 85 | 76 | 40 | | |

* 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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 258 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 500 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| 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 | 18 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 34 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | |
| BLK | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 43 | | | |
| MUL | 58 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | | | |
| FRL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |

| 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 | 31 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 43 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | | | |
| BLK | 46 | | | |
| HSP | 51 | | | |

| 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% |
| MUL | 51 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | | | |
| FRL | 50 | | | |

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 | 39 | | | 53 | | | 25 | 50 | 53 | | | 38 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 26 | | | 8 | 22 | | | 5 | 18 |
| ELL | 30 | | | 49 | | | 15 | 38 | 31 | | 6 | 38 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | | | 79 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 38 | | | 51 | | | 21 | 50 | 52 | | 6 | 30 |
| HSP | 37 | | | 55 | | | 34 | 45 | 51 | | 6 | 37 |
| MUL | 31 | | | 85 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | | | 70 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| FRL | 36 | | | 51 | | | 23 | 47 | 47 | | 6 | 33 |

| 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 | 36 | 44 | 41 | 43 | 61 | 59 | 30 | 46 | 83 | | | 57 |
| SWD | 11 | 39 | 43 | 19 | 46 | 52 | 9 | 18 | | | | 41 |
| ELL | 24 | 39 | 42 | 36 | 59 | 50 | 16 | 36 | 74 | | | 57 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | 65 | | 94 | 88 | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 33 | 42 | 40 | 37 | 57 | 60 | 27 | 44 | 84 | | | 33 |
| HSP | 37 | 46 | 43 | 50 | 65 | 52 | 33 | 47 | 76 | | | 61 |
| MUL | 38 | 40 | | 50 | 77 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 50 | | 54 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 44 | 41 | 42 | 61 | 60 | 29 | 45 | 84 | | | 57 |

| 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 | 39 | 36 | 26 | 32 | 20 | 19 | 25 | 35 | 64 | | | 40 |
| SWD | 9 | 18 | 17 | 14 | 18 | 19 | 11 | 8 | 40 | | | 35 |
| ELL | 35 | 40 | 34 | 34 | 22 | 10 | 12 | 32 | 62 | | | 40 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 79 | 71 | | 71 | 43 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 33 | 25 | 27 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 31 | 59 | | | 52 |
| HSP | 44 | 42 | 28 | 40 | 23 | 9 | 29 | 42 | 72 | | | 35 |
| MUL | 67 | 53 | | 57 | 21 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 43 | | 40 | 29 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 36 | 26 | 31 | 19 | 18 | 25 | 35 | 62 | | | 40 |

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 |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 34% | 48% | -14% | 47% | -13% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 47% | -10% | 47% | -10% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 45% | -6% | 47% | -8% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 54% | -3% | 54% | -3% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 18% | 36% | -18% | 48% | -30% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 65% | -1% | 55% | 9% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 46% | -22% | 44% | -20% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 84% | 48% | 36% | 50% | 34% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 92% | 50% | 42% | 48% | 44% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 65% | -16% | 66% | -17% |

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 with the lowest performance for the 2022-2023 school year was 7th Grade Math with 17%, which is down from 20% from the 2021-2022 school year. One factor contributing to this low number is that the only students that take the seventh grade math assessment are the level one and two students. Usually, 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. This year many of the level two student also took the eighth grade test leading to lower scores on the 7th grade math assessment.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year was Science moving from 29% to 24%. Factors that contributed to this decline was the large number of standards tested at the eighth grade level that were taught in sixth and seventh grades with no consistent assessment or accountability at those grade levels.

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.

Seventh grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average, with 18% compared to 48%. The main factor contributing to this low number is that the only students that take the seventh grade math assessment are the level one and two students. Level three, four and five students take the eighth grade test at the end of the year. This typically causes the seventh grade math proficiency to be very low.

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

Eighth grade math showed the most improvement by far moving from 49% to 64%. The level three, four and five students take eighth grade math and the eighth grade test at the end of the year. Level two students were also added to those taking the eighth grade assessment. The level two students received added supporting instruction by way of tutorials and Intensive Math classes.

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

One major area of concern is the number of students scoring level 1 on the ELA statewide assessment.

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

Our highest priorities will be our Students with Disabilities (SWD).

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

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 2022-2023 school year was 33%. 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: 11%
 SWD Math Achievement: 19%
 SWD Science Achievement: 9%
 SWD Civics Achievement: 18%

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 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 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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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?

Yes

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

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

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

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

Field Trips/Labs

- Standards-based hands on activities and labs to deepen knowledge and connection of the standards
- Professional Development of B.E.S.T. standards

Person Responsible: Jeremiah Stewart (jeremiah.stewart@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: December 21, 2023

#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.

Based on the number of suspensions and the number of students with absences totaling more than 10% of school days, we must create a welcoming, positive school culture and environment that reflects a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

20% decline in referrals

10% decrease in number of student missing greater than 10% of school days

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly reports regarding attendance and discipline referrals

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cara Davis-Henry (cara.davis-henry@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.)

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 during lunch for various incentives.

Culture of Diversity: Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida Standards and content required by Florida 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 content areas.

Counselors and the Behavior Health Specialist provide services for any student who might need more assistance.

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBS encourages students to perform at their highest ability and rewards students for proficiency and growth

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?

Yes

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.

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: Cara Davis-Henry (cara.davis-henry@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: December 21, 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School improvement funding is allocated through Title 1 funds. All funds are based on the needs of our students including SWD. Resources based on their needs have been identified using the data, and purchased to support academic achievement. We have purchased Common Lit for ELA and Intensive Reading,, Flow-Cabulary for all content areas, and Penda Learning for all Science classes. We are also working with the school district provided resources such as Reading Plus for our Intensive Reading classes, IXL and Khan Academy for our Intensive Math classes.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring