

The School District of Palm Beach County

Alexander W Dreyfoos Junior School Of The Arts School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 13 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| 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 |

Alexander W Dreyfoos Junior School Of The Arts

501 S SAPODILLA AVE, West Palm Beach, FL 33401

<https://dsoa.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.

The Alexander W. Dreyfoos School of the Arts is committed to providing a world-class arts and academic education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach their highest potential. We are committed to allow our students to find their own identity, while remaining part of a diverse community. We are also committed to attracting and retaining a highly qualified and professional staff who work each day to foster the knowledge, innovation, creativity, and ethical behavior within our students that will be required for responsible citizenship and a productive career.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Alexander W. Dreyfoos School of the Arts envisions the development of a dynamic, diverse, collaborative, and multicultural community of citizens where lifelong learning in the arts and the academics are valued and supported. Our students will contribute to and enrich their communities, using their strong foundations in the arts and the academics, in order to succeed as global citizens and to meet the challenges and complexities of the 21st century.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Bennett, Blake | Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All operations of the school - All teachers and staff - Artists in Residence - Assistant Principals - Budget - Contracts - Curriculum Council - Community liaison - Data analysis - Deliberate practice - Discipline referrals monitor - EBC - ESE / 504 meetings - Facilities projects - Focused Model of Instruction - Foundation - Guest speakers - Hiring - Master Schedule - Monitoring all instruction - Personnel - PLC Coordinator - Prism - Professional development - Prom - SAC - School improvement - School safety and supervision - School / Community facilitator - Supervision / evaluation and PLC's (Dance) - Supplements (clubs / sports / activities) - Teacher Handbook and SOP - Graduation - Suicide Risk Assessment team - Threat Assessment team |
| Finney, Teneisha | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Testing supervisor (organization & oversight) - PSAT / SAT / EOC / FAST - Campus supervision - Data analysis - Data processor back-up - Discipline - art area - Supervision / evaluation and PLC's (Data Processor, school counseling, media center, Social Studies, Theatre) - Freshmen / New Student Invasion - Grad Bash - IEP / 504 accommodations for testing - Master Schedule supervisor |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------|------------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mental health - Monitor iObservation - Monitor each graduating cohort - Multicultural events coordinator - PRISM - Prom - Revolution Prep contact - Schedule changes - SIS coordinator - Student registration - Edgenuity program (school year and summer) - Withdrawal codes - Subject area tutoring coordinator - Suicide Risk Assessment team - Threat Assessment team - Other duties as assigned by Principal |
| Lewis, Ron | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AED coordinator - AICE Coordinator - Athletics - Campus security and supervision - Clubs (including supplements for clubs and sports) - Crisis Plan Manager (evacuations / drills) - Data analysis - Detentions - Discipline - art area - ESP / TOP - SAC - Grad Bash - Supervision / evaluation and PLC's (Custodians, Digital Media, English / Reading, Foreign Language, PE, Visual Arts) - Graduation liaison - Keys - Facilities supervision (daily operations, capital projects, cleanliness, repairs, safety issues, walkies) - PRISM - Prom - Reading Plus Insight - Safety Committee - SIP - Student activity programs (AC requests, student events) - Supervision plan - Subject area tutoring coordinator - Suicide Risk Assessment team - Threat Assessment team - Other duties as assigned by Principal |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Napuli, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accreditation: Cognia - Acceleration - ACT NCR testing - AP curriculum supervisor - AP testing supervisor - Calendar - Campus supervision - CTE supervisor - CTE testing - Curriculum Council - Data analysis - Discipline - art area - Facilities designer - Grad Bash - Supervisor / evaluation and PLC's (Music, Science, CTE, AP courses) - Industry Certification / CTE supervisor - Magnet co-planner - Newsletter - Prospective Parent Night (shared) - Professional development - PGP Liaison - Parking - PRISM - Prom - School website - Social media - Student activity programs (calendar, field trips, SRA's) - Textbooks - Destiny - Threat Assessment - Threat Management Chair - AICE - team member / back-up - SOAFI liaison - Subject area tutoring coordinator - Suicide Risk Assessment team - Threat Assessment team - Video board - Other duties as assigned by Principal |
| Clark, William | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AP testing - Artists in Residence - Assets and property records - Student attendance - Campus supervision - Data analysis - Discipline - art area - Theatre technician - SBT / RTI monitor - Caring Counts |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lunch Bunch group - PSAT / SAT / state testing team - Functional Behavior Assessments - Grad Bash - Supervision / evaluation and PLC's (Math, Communications, ESE, ELL, Theatre Tech, STST) - Math Bootcamps - Monitor mandatory PD - Oversee 504 Plans and implementation - Student accommodations supervisor (504 / IEP) - PRISM - Prom - Support Facilitation - Transportation - Threat Management Vice Chair - Tri-Rail - Volunteer / Business Coordinator - Subject area tutoring coordinator - Suicide Risk Assessment team - Threat Assessment team - Other duties as assigned by Principal |
| Arterburn, Alyssa | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Articulation with feeder schools - Arts Deans Chair - Attendance, disciplinary & Magnet appeals - CTE meetings - Coordination of Artist in Residence & Guest Artist program - Data analysis - Supervision / evaluation and PLC's (English / Reading) - FTE / SIS Coordinator - Grad Bash - Incoming student registration - Industry Certification - Literacy Team Coordinator - Magnet admissions / auditions - Master schedule - New Student Invasion - Newsletter - Payroll backup - Prospective Parent Night (shared) - PRISM - Prom - PSAT / SAT / state testing team - Preparation of all Magnet materials - Probation - arts / academics / attendance - School website - Social media coordinator - SOAFI Liaison |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------|----------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Subject area tutoring coordinator - Suicide Risk Assessment team - Threat Assessment team - SWPBS Chair - Other duties as assigned by Principal |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Testing Coordinator - Campus supervision - Data analysis - Grad Bash - Math subject area assistant - New Student Invasion - Newsletter - PBS Internal Coach - PSAT / SAT / state testing team - PRISM - Prom - Teacher Orientation Program (TOP) |
| Ray, Sarah | Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SAC - SEL Coordinator - SIP - SIS teacher attendance tracking - Social media - SOP / Handbook - Student Government - Student incentives - SWPBS Contact - Tardies - Teacher incentives / Spotlight - Wellness Coordinator - Other duties as assigned by Principal |

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.

Data is analyzed and discussed by the school's administrative team, which includes the principal, assistant principals, TOSA's, School Counseling Dean, and ESE specialist. The school leadership team meets with all of the department deans (including academic and art departments) to provide a School Improvement Plan Department Input form. Each department dean are provided with relevant data and invited to meet with their respective departments to discuss their department's greatest success during the previous school year; action steps, strategies, and professional development that led to those successes; action steps, strategies, and professional development that were least effective; one goal their department will work toward during the current school year; and any new action steps, strategies,

and professional development that the department plans to implement during the current school year. Department deans meet with their teachers to provide feedback, in writing, to these prompts and then provide that feedback to the administrative team. At the first SAC meeting of the school year, the administrative team explains the SIP process to the SAC attendees and provides them a copy of the previous year's Plan. At the second SAC meeting of the school year, the SAC is provided the SIP goals for the current school year and the rationale behind them. The SAC is then provided a draft of the current year's Plan and given time to submit feedback. At the third meeting of the school year, the SAC votes on approval of the current year's 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))

Student assessments will be utilized to regularly monitor the effective implementation and impact of the SIP. Student assessments include FAST Progress Monitoring, which occur 3 times per year, Performance matters assessments, Florida Standards Assessments, and district diagnostics. Teachers are trained to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction based on the results of the data.

Teachers meet with their Professional Learning Communities within their departments bi-weekly to analyze data, modify instruction and create standards-based lessons. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed to ensure the best results for student growth and continuous school improvement. Monitoring will take place throughout the year in tested subjects by tracking the mastery of grade-level benchmarks through the use of district provided Unit Assessments.

The leadership team has devised a variety of monitoring strategies. At the outset, teachers will present comprehensive lesson plans to their respective assistant principals at the start of each semester. This deliberate approach ensures alignment with educational objectives. Drawing upon up-to-date data, the team will make well-informed instructional choices, improving learning outcomes. In addition to these efforts, the leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs and formal observations, strengthening their commitment to maintaining instructional quality. The team actively engages in Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings to reinforce the collaborative culture of our school. This multifaceted approach underscores our dedication to continuous improvement and the elevation of our educational standards.

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) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 53% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 33% |
| 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) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

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* | 91 | 52 | 50 | 93 | 55 | 51 | 93 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 73 | | | 70 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 69 | | | 73 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 84 | 38 | 38 | 83 | 42 | 38 | 74 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 62 | | | 26 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 63 | | | 32 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 93 | 68 | 64 | 97 | 43 | 40 | 92 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 95 | 67 | 66 | 97 | 53 | 48 | 94 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 46 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 99 | 90 | 89 | 99 | 65 | 61 | 100 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 94 | 71 | 65 | 96 | 69 | 67 | 94 | | |
| ELP Progress | | 40 | 45 | | | | | | |

** 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 | 93 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 556 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | 99 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 83 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 832 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | 99 |

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 | 71 | | | |
| ELL | 72 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |

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% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ASN | 98 | | | |
| BLK | 82 | | | |
| HSP | 94 | | | |
| MUL | 96 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 94 | | | |
| FRL | 89 | | | |

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 | 60 | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 91 | | | |
| BLK | 76 | | | |
| HSP | 81 | | | |
| MUL | 84 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 86 | | | |
| FRL | 81 | | | |

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 | 91 | | | 84 | | | 93 | 95 | | 99 | 94 | |
| SWD | 63 | | | 60 | | | | 70 | | 60 | 5 | |

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 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| ELL | 73 | | | 70 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 94 | | | 95 | | | 97 | 100 | | 100 | 6 | |
| BLK | 83 | | | 63 | | | 80 | 89 | | 77 | 6 | |
| HSP | 90 | | | 91 | | | 95 | 92 | | 96 | 6 | |
| MUL | 97 | | | 92 | | | 100 | 100 | | 93 | 6 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 92 | | | 87 | | | 94 | 96 | | 95 | 6 | |
| FRL | 84 | | | 79 | | | 91 | 90 | | 89 | 6 | |

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 | 93 | 73 | 69 | 83 | 62 | 63 | 97 | 97 | | 99 | 96 | |
| SWD | 64 | 48 | 40 | 70 | 47 | | 88 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 100 | 85 | | 89 | 53 | | 100 | 97 | | 100 | 100 | |
| BLK | 85 | 56 | 50 | 74 | 55 | 71 | 90 | 94 | | 100 | 83 | |
| HSP | 92 | 70 | 62 | 84 | 63 | 50 | 99 | 98 | | 100 | 94 | |
| MUL | 92 | 76 | 79 | 87 | 53 | | 88 | 95 | | 93 | 92 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 94 | 77 | 74 | 85 | 67 | 65 | 99 | 98 | | 99 | 98 | |
| FRL | 88 | 70 | 63 | 77 | 62 | 69 | 96 | 94 | | 100 | 92 | |

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 | 93 | 70 | 73 | 74 | 26 | 32 | 92 | 94 | | 100 | 94 | |
| SWD | 80 | 67 | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 70 | 80 | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 95 | 77 | 69 | 85 | 31 | | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 89 | 63 | 72 | 54 | 25 | 29 | 84 | 87 | | 100 | 77 | |
| HSP | 90 | 69 | 67 | 76 | 33 | 35 | 92 | 89 | | 100 | 95 | |
| MUL | 95 | 78 | 70 | 75 | 18 | | 95 | 93 | | 100 | 96 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 94 | 70 | 80 | 78 | 23 | 31 | 92 | 96 | | 100 | 95 | |
| FRL | 89 | 63 | 69 | 68 | 28 | 37 | 89 | 90 | | 100 | 88 | |

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 |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 92% | 50% | 42% | 50% | 42% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 91% | 48% | 43% | 48% | 43% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 77% | 48% | 29% | 50% | 27% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 90% | 50% | 40% | 48% | 42% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 93% | 63% | 30% | 63% | 30% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 95% | 62% | 33% | 63% | 32% |

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.

Our school outperformed every other high school in the District in almost every data component. However, our data component with the lowest overall performance was our math achievement (87%). Breaking this down further, our overall Algebra 1 EOC achievement level was 78%, while our overall Geometry EOC achievement level was 90%. Although our Algebra 1 achievement level was higher than all other high schools in the District, we do face some unique challenges. Most of the students who arrive on our campus as 9th graders have already taken and passed the Algebra 1 EOC and Geometry EOC in middle school. This means that our data set of students taking these exams is small. Additionally, the students who enroll in Algebra 1 and/or Geometry at our school are the students who have low previous scale scores in math as compared to our overall student population. This means that our teachers must devote significant time to remediation of previous math skills in addition to Algebra 1 skills acquisition. However, our overall math achievement level has been going up steadily in recent years, from 74% in FY21 to 83% in FY22 to 87% in FY23.

If we focus on standards-based instruction to increase learning gains in school-wide ELA and Math, then we will

increase student achievement and ensure alignment with the District's Strategic Plan; This area of focus aligns directly with our District Strategic Plan, Theme A-Goal 3, Academic Excellence & Growth. Our first instructional priority is to deliver, content, concept, or skill that is aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

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

Although we outperformed every other high school in the District on our Biology EOC overall achievement, this data component showed the greatest decline from FY22 to FY23. In FY22, our Biology EOC achievement level was 97%, while it was 93% in FY23. In FY23, we had a new teacher teaching our lowest level Biology (regular) students; this teacher was new to our school and new to teaching Biology as well and had a 30% pass rate difference when compared to her predecessor.

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

Our school outperformed the state average in every data component. However, the smallest gap is found in our Algebra 1 EOC performance: the state average was 54%, while our school's achievement level was 78%. Although we outperformed the state by 24 percentage points, this is our smallest gap when compared with the state average. Most of the students who arrive on our campus as 9th graders have already taken and passed the Algebra 1 EOC and Geometry EOC in middle school. This means that our data set of students taking these exams is small. Additionally, the students who enroll in Algebra

1 and/or Geometry at our school are the students who have low previous scale scores in math as compared to our overall student population. This means that our teachers must devote significant time to remediation of previous math skills in addition to Algebra 1 skills acquisition. However, our overall math achievement level has been going up steadily in recent years, from 74% in FY21 to 83% in FY22 to 87% in FY23.

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 from FY22 to FY23 was our overall math achievement level. In FY22, our achievement level was 83%. We went up by 4 percentage points to an achievement level of 87% in FY23. Increasing our overall math achievement by 2 percentage points - from 83% in FY22 to 85% in FY23 - was one of our FY23 SIP goals. We exceeded that goal by 2 percentage points. During FY23, a team of administrators, counselors, and teachers utilized diagnostic and formative assessment data to monitor individual students' progress toward standards-based learning goals. This data was discussed and analyzed at PLC's and incorporated into teachers' lesson planning. A team of administrators, counselors, and teachers also initiated an individualized mentorship program, including Saturday sessions, designed to help students in need achieve mastery on their exams. Frequent parent communication was also a key component of our FY23 strategies.

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

Helping every student succeed is a primary concern. By focusing on the area of concern below, we will help ensure our students receive the help and support needed for achievement and success. When looking at our Early Warning System data, our potential area of concern is students with 10% or more absences.

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

1. Our school plans to increase the overall ELA achievement level of our ELA Low 25% students by 3 percentage points from SY23 (61%) to 64% in SY24.
2. Our school plans to increase positive response by students to the SEQ prompt "Students respect each other at this school" from SY23 (74%) to 78% in SY24.
3. Our school plans to increase our students' overall math achievement by 1 percentage point from SY23 (87%) to 88% in SY24.

Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:

- (g) History of the 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

2. Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-

control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.

3. Our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts.

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 ELA**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.

Our area of focus relating to ELA concerns our Low 25% cohort of 9th and 10th graders, as measured by their performance on the SY23 Progress Monitoring 3 exam. Our SIP goal is as follows: Our school plans to increase the overall ELA achievement level of our ELA Low 25% students by 3 percentage points from SY23 (61%) to 64% in SY24. All of our SY23 achievement data demonstrate that we outperformed every other high school in the District in nearly every category, and we are significantly above the District and state averages in every category. Our overall ELA achievement level was 91%. With overall achievement levels that high, we are digging deeper to focus on our lowest-performing students. We looked at our current 9th grade students and how they performed on their 8th grade PM3 exam, and our 10th grade students and how they performed on their 9th grade PM3 exam. Combining these data sets, we calculated our Low 25% cohort of students and found an overall achievement level of only 61% in that cohort. The cohort includes 3 9th grade students who scored a level 1 and 31 9th grade students who scored a level 2; 13 10th grade students who scored a level 1 and 19 10th grade students who scored a level 2. Combined, we have 16 students who scored a level 1 and 50 students who scored a level 2, meaning we have 66 students who are below proficiency level. We will focus on helping these students achieve proficiency, as well as on helping our students who scored a lower-level level 3 to increase their scores.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our school plans to increase the overall ELA achievement level of our ELA Low 25% students by 3 percentage points from SY23 (61%) to 64% in SY24.

Monitoring:

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

Low 25% ELA students will be identified by looking at 8th grade PM3 data for current 9th graders 9th grade PM3 data for current 10th graders. The Reading Plus assessment will be administered to students to provide a baseline data set for literacy performance. Looking at SY23 PM achievement data, as well as Reading Plus data, a team of administrators, counselors, and teachers will identify individualized deficiencies for each student to be able to create individualized plans that include support, monitoring, and regular check-ins with students. We will use PM1 data to help establish individualized goals, PM2 data as formative assessment to make adjustments as needed, and we will also use USA and FSQ data to inform instruction. PM3 data will be utilized as the final monitoring tool. We will also incorporate literacy strategies into implementation of Florida State Statute 1003.42 and District Policy 2.09.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ron Lewis (ronald.lewis@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.)

A team of administrators, counselors, and teachers will initiate an individualized mentorship program to address students in need. Data that will be used to determine who these students are include SY23 PM3 achievement data and Reading Plus data. Data that will be used to monitor these students include PM1 and PM2 results, USA and FSQ results, course grades, teacher feedback, and Phonics Inventory results. Administrators and counselors will meet with each student to set goals and benchmarks that are timely and attainable, and to identify strategies and resources that are tailored to each student's needs. Parent communication will be made as well. Administrators and counselors will continue to meet with students and monitor their progress. Based on each student's progress and formative assessment data, plans will

be updated as needed. The mentorship program will include plans and strategies to address students' social-emotional wellbeing as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Individualized instruction is essential to student success, as each student has individualized needs. Through collaboration between administrators and counselors to address individual student needs in other settings, such as through our Caring Counts meetings and SBT, we have had a positive impact on students' achievement as well as their social-emotional wellbeing, which has been shown to play an important role in student achievement as well. Effective use of formative assessment data by teachers is necessary to keep lesson plans and individualized strategies relevant, and effective communication between administrators, counselors, and teachers is necessary to create and implement strategies that consider the whole student. Use of Reading Plus and Phonics Inventory data in combination with USA and FSQ results, PM1 and PM2 results, course grades, and teacher feedback has also been shown to be an effective strategy for gauging students' areas of need.

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.

1. Using 8th grade and 9th grade PM3 data, identify students who are in our ELA Low 25% cohort.

Person Responsible: Ron Lewis (ronald.lewis@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: August 31, 2023

2. Use Reading Plus and Phonics Inventory data, as well as PM1 data, to begin to create individually tailored plans for each student in our ELA Low 25%.

Person Responsible: Ron Lewis (ronald.lewis@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023

3. Together with teachers and counselors, develop timely, achievable, and measurable goals for students in the ELA Low 25%.

Person Responsible: Ron Lewis (ronald.lewis@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: October 31, 2023

4. Using USA results, FSQ results, course grades, teacher feedback, and PM2 results, continue to monitor and update individualized plans as needed.

Person Responsible: Ron Lewis (ronald.lewis@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout school year.

5. Continue to meet with students and communicate with teachers and counselors to put individualized plans into action and monitor results.

Person Responsible: Ron Lewis (ronald.lewis@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout school year.

#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.

Our area of focus pertaining to improving positive culture and environment is improving the extent to which students at our school respect each other. Reviewing the SY23 School Effectiveness Questionnaire (SEQ), approximately 74% of students felt positively that they were respected by other students at our school. Our SIP goal is as follows: our school plans to increase positive response by students to the SEQ prompt "Students respect each other at this school" from SY23 (74%) to 78% in SY24. Our SEQ was completed by 84% of our student population in SY23 and 80% or more of students answered positively in the following topics on the SEQ: Family Involvement, Safety, School Effectiveness, and Student Agency. Student Mental Health and Wellness scored slightly lower at approximately 79% overall. This goal was developed by continuing analysis into Mental Health and Wellness. The topic showed that 83% of students felt respected by their teachers and adults on campus and that 82% of students have at least one adult on campus they feel they can talk to. Compared to other high schools in the District, our school's students feel more respected and safe at school; however, when looking at the subgroup data from the SEQ, there are smaller gaps between those data points. As a District, approximately 51% of high school students feel respected by their peers on campus. At our school, approximately 60% of Black students and approximately 66% of ESE students reported feeling respected by other students at school. We will focus on helping all students feel respected by other students at school and within our school community.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our school plans to increase positive response by students to the SEQ prompt "Students respect each other at this school" from SY23 (74%) to 78% in SY24.

Monitoring:

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

A team of administrators, counselors, teachers, and students will create a school-based focus group to identify the root cause of the problem. This group will utilize student surveys to gather essential data regarding the comprehension of respect. Subsequently, they will collaborate to develop and implement school-wide initiatives in conjunction with the PBIS team and Student Government Association. Specifically, they will deliver comprehensive PBS lessons on Respect at the outset of the academic year and subsequently in January during the second semester. The team will systematically collect data through observations, student feedback, and survey results to evaluate the efficacy of their interventions, with the SY24 SEQ serving as a primary metric. Furthermore, attendance and discipline records will be monitored to gauge progress towards the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@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.)

The evidence-based interventions being implemented to increase positive school culture and students feeling respected by their peers will include a myriad of school-wide initiatives to target this goal. The PBIS team will create a school-wide lesson on respect and will deliver it through all classes at the beginning of the second semester. PBIS will also utilize the universal guideline at our school that all students "Show up for the A.R.T.S." (Accountable, Respectful, Trustworthy Students and Staff). The PBIS team will collaborate with students to create a Respect campaign on campus to educate our students about what respect means and how it looks on a school campus. Teachers will integrate SLL practices in their

classrooms. DSOA will also integrate Resiliency and Character lessons throughout the school year. Finally, our student leaders will take an active role in ensuring that all students are respected on campus through clubs and organizations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen strategies for improving the culture at our school are grounded in their holistic and multi-pronged approach. By combining evidence-based interventions, we aim to address creating a positive and respectful environment. Initiatives like the school-wide Respect lesson, universal guidelines, and the collaborative Respect campaign involve all students in understanding and embodying respectful behavior. Integrating SLL practices and character lessons throughout the school year equips students with essential skills for positive interactions. Additionally, the active participation of student leaders in club initiatives and collaboration with student organization presidents amplifies their role in ensuring mutual respect. This comprehensive strategy recognizes that a positive school culture is a collective effort, necessitating collaboration between administrators, counselors, teachers, parents, and students. It aims to instill a culture of respect and accountability, fostering an environment where all members of our school's community feel valued and supported.

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.

1. Meet with the PBIS team to review universal guidelines and school-wide expectations.

Person Responsible: Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: September 15, 2023

2. Create a Respect lesson and plan for implementation.

Person Responsible: Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: December 1, 2023

3. Collaborate with SGA to launch a year-long student-led Respect campaign.

Person Responsible: Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: October 1, 2023.

4. Coordinate with all of the student leadership on campus to conduct a roundtable discussion about how to increase respect among students.

Person Responsible: Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: November 1, 2023

5. Send out PBCSD SLL lessons to all teachers to utilize in their classrooms and lesson planning.

Person Responsible: Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: January 31, 2023

6. Conduct quarterly school-wide surveys to gather feedback and guide planning.

Person Responsible: Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Quarterly, throughout school-year.