

The School District of Palm Beach County

Meadow Park Elementary 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Meadow Park Elementary School

956 FLORIDA MANGO RD, West Palm Beach, FL 33406

<https://mdpe.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 mission of Meadow Park Elementary is to challenge all students to reach their maximum potential and to empower them with the knowledge to develop academic, social, physical and emotional skills necessary for them to become productive and contributing members to an ever changing society with the collaboration of teachers, parents and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Meadow Park Elementary School team envisions a dynamic, collaborative, multicultural community where lifelong learning is valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential as well as succeed in the global economy.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Patrick, Kelly	Principal	The Principal manages and supervises all aspects of the educational program. The Principal is the instructional leader of this school and manages daily operations of the school. She is responsible for the equitable instructions for all students. The Principal is the decision maker in regards to the master schedule, staff assignments, teacher evaluations and supervision, the curriculum, professional development, PLC's, and school improvement and enrichment activities. She is also responsible for all budgetary decisions and contracts. The Principal will oversee the School Based Team and Rtl process as well as the Child Study Team to ensure students are getting the proper interventions and services required by law. The Principal will monitor the safety of the school and continuously make adjustments as needed. The Principal also monitors the implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. This will include but not limited to lesson plan checks, iObservation, classroom walkthroughs and conferences as well as grade level specific data analysis. The Principal is responsible for new initiatives including Dual Language, AVID, STEM and Fine Arts Programs. The Principal works collaboratively with the administrative staff to create the master schedules, student placements, and classroom coverage.
White, Cassandra	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal oversees academics by participating in PLC meetings and conducting classroom observations. The AP manages the school google drive and calendar, transportation, Crisis Plan/Safety Drills, the ESP (New Teacher Program), faculty/staff duties, field trip requests, District/State Testing, Title I, Textbook Management and School Wide Positive Behavior. The AP assists with creating the master schedules, student placements, and classroom coverage.
Haag, Susan	Other	The SSCC will co-facilitate PLC's with Team Leaders, help monitor students' progress on testing and will work with administration to build capacity for standards based instruction. The SSCC follows the coaching model to ensure all teachers get the proper support for academics and classroom management. The SSCC assists with creating the master schedules, student placements, and classroom coverage.

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.

The school administrative team, leadership team, team leaders, staff and families will be involved in the development of the SIP. Input from all stakeholders during meetings will be taken into account after reviewing overall school data as well as grade level data. ESSA subgroups will be a priority (SWD's) as well as any subgroup close to the cutoff for ESSA. Prioritizing needs and gaining input on materials/strategies needed to meet the needs of the SIP will be obtained and kept on file to ensure all stakeholders voices are heard and ideas are captured in the SIP. Updates on school data and ESSA subgroup progress will be shared at all stakeholder meetings on a monthly basis.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for the fidelity of implementation by conducting administrative classroom walkthroughs and observations, common planning through regular PLC meetings and grade level planning. In additions, staff will be asked to give feedback on parent/community events that are aligned with the SIP. Our team will strategically plan to monitor lesson plans, current/ongoing data, student attendance, formative/summative assessments and technology use. Data on assessments and feedback from stakeholders will be shared with the leadership team to make timely adjustments. Our team will strategically plan to monitor lesson plans, current/ongoing data, student attendance, formative/summative assessments and technology use.

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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	80%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	52	28	22	18	17	19	0	0	0	156	
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	7	16	31	21	1	2	0	0	0	78	
Course failure in Math	8	2	28	18	0	3	0	0	0	59	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	11	19	0	0	0	64	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	10	28	0	0	0	58	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	13	22	15	7	9	0	0	0	68	

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	8	7	26	29	10	21	0	0	0	101

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	31	18	17	15	14	0	0	0	95	
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	20	4	3	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	14	4	6	0	0	0	30	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	8	11	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	0	0	19	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	5	12	4	6	0	0	0	27	

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	4	4	12	6	16	0	0	0	42

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	31	18	17	15	14	0	0	0	95	
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	20	4	3	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	14	4	6	0	0	0	30	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	8	11	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	0	0	19	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	5	12	4	6	0	0	0	27	

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	4	4	12	6	16	0	0	0	42

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	71	53	53	72	59	56	74		
ELA Learning Gains				70			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			65		
Math Achievement*	71	57	59	67	53	50	66		
Math Learning Gains				59			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			27		
Science Achievement*	70	54	54	47	59	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	56	59	67			55		

** 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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	339
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	68			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	69			

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	36	Yes	2	
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	66			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	60			

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	71			71			70					60
SWD	26			29			18				5	40
ELL	69			71			75				5	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	65			40			50				3	
HSP	70			71			72				5	61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72			76			69				5	50
FRL	71			71			76				5	60

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	72	70	58	67	59	52	47					67
SWD	21	44	50	21	41	35	19					54
ELL	74	74	56	68	63	45	43					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	53	70	45	53	58	17					
HSP	76	75	73	68	59	56	55					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71	60	27	69	60	42	36					45
FRL	69	71	57	64	58	53	44					67

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	74	71	65	66	52	27	48					55
SWD	33	56	56	31	28	8	16					46
ELL	78	75	67	68	50	36	43					55
AMI	64			64								
ASN												
BLK	71			48								
HSP	77	81	82	67	55	23	50					54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	67	60	65	56	40	44					55
FRL	73	72	64	65	52	16	49					52

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	65%	56%	9%	54%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	58%	16%	58%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	48%	10%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	54%	46%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	57%	6%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	52%	21%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	51%	12%	51%	12%

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 below demonstrates the achievement levels of all our tested grade levels in all content areas including our ESSA identified subgroup:
FY19 FY21 FY22

Overall ELA Achievement 68% 74% 72%

ELA Achievement SWD's 24% 33% 21%

ELA Achievement ELL's 68% 78% 74%

ELA Achievement Black 53% 71% 32%

Overall ELA Learning Gains 65% 71% 70%

ELA Learning Gains SWD's 37% 56% 44%

ELA Learning Gains ELL's 71% 75% 74%

ELA Learning Gains Black 33% -- 53%

Our overall data trends show that our focus on literacy that includes remediation of standards, foundational skills and scaffolding instruction that meets the full intent and rigor of standards in all

content areas has proven to maintain our percentage with a slight decrease in students with disabilities and black students. Our ESSA subgroup, SWD's shows a decrease from FY21-FY22. The SWD's continue to receive strategic, be targeted support through various modes of instruction, including technology, small group, tutorials, data chats and student monitoring.

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

Based on the data trends, our focus will be to increase the overall ELA achievement for grades 3, 4 and 5 while include writing across content areas with a hyperfocus on our SWD subgroup. If we do not support these concerns, we are increasing the learning gaps, and students' academic journey. When we focus on literacy, math and science with remediation of standards, foundational skills, while scaffolding instruction that meets the full intent and rigor of standards in all content areas we will support all learners.

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.

Meadow Park State Average

3rd ELA 58% 50%

4th ELA 74% 58%

5th ELA 65% 54%

3rd Math 63% 59%

4th Math 73% 61%

5th Math 63% 55%

6th Math 100% 54%

5th Science 63% 51%

Although our average scores for grades 3-5 are above the district and state averages, when compared to our historical data from MPES, our primary focus will be on 3rd grade ELA (drop of 9% from FY22 to FY23) and Math (drop of 12% from FY 22 to FY23) since those scores appeared to have dropped. A contributing factor to this decrease is potentially comparing data from FSA to FAST testing. When reflecting on these drops, we believe our focus needs to be on third grade ELA and Math, with a specific focus on our SWD subgroup in 3rd grade and providing focused small group instructions utilizing hands on materials. These students should also be seen in small group by the ESE and homeroom teachers daily. With a vacancy in a full time ESE position in FY23, this limited the amount of small group support provided to that subgroup. We will foster collaboration and data-focused conversations to monitor student progress. By focusing on standards-based instruction in PLC's we can ensure that all students receive rigorous instruction and small group support to meet their needs.

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

Our science data increased from 48% to 63% showing an increase in proficiency by 15%. With the addition of funding from Title I to support hands on materials for labs as well as the purchase of 5th grade Science IXL and Science Studies Weekly, students were given daily instruction in science with standards based instruction. PLC's for science were added as well to allow science teachers to plan standards based labs and collaborate on lesson planning based on ongoing student data (both formative and summative).

4th grade math increased from 64% to 73% showing a 9% increase. During the FY22 school year, all third grade students that were tested in FY23 were in AMP3 and pushed to the highest level of the math

standards. Going into 4th grade, all students had the best opportunity to succeed based on the instruction from the previous year and the collaborative planning amongst the 4th grade team during team planning and PLC's. With the focus on utilizing hands on manipulatives and the use of IXL for math, students were enriched or remediated based on individual data from formative and summative assessments.

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

Ensuring students success is at the forefront of our focus. By addressing the areas of 10% or more absences and Reading Deficiency across grade levels, we will ensure our students receive the support they need to grow academically.

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

1. Professional Development/Professional Learning Communities: Teachers will engage in deep, focused professional development, collaborative planning, and data analysis to strengthen standards-based instructional practices to accelerate student learning in ELA, Mathematics, and Science, particularly within the ESSA subgroup (SWD's). PLCs continue to be an active part of our school schedule; they receive embedded PD. In addition, teachers and staff participate in ongoing PD including how to incorporate adaptive technology in their rooms, AVID strategies to help with notetaking and organizational skills and small group, differentiated instruction.
2. Push in model for SWD's and ELL's for ESE and ELL support. Teachers will work collaboratively to ensure all students are given small group instruction and explicit instruction.
3. Focus on SWD's when creating the master schedule to ensure additional opportunities for small group, targeted instruction.
4. Continue to foster a collaborative culture of learning and improvement by including multiple stakeholders in the continuous improvement process.

In addition, as an early intervention to increase student readiness to enter Kindergarten, we offer Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Program supplemented with enrichment hours and a PreK self-contained program for students ages 3 to 5 determined eligible for exceptional student education based on goals and services as written on the Individual Education Plan. These programs are supported by the Department of Early Childhood Education and the Department of Exceptional Student Education and follow all Florida statutes, rules, and contractual mandates.

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.

If we focus on standards-based small group instruction to increase achievement for SWD's in ELA and Math, then we will increase student achievement and ensure alignment to the District's Strategic Plan. This area of focus aligns directly with our District Strategic Plan, Theme A-Goal 3, Academic Excellence and growth. Our first instructional priority is to deliver core instruction aligned to the benchmarks and intended learning outcomes.

ELA

3rd-27%

4th-36%

5th-9%

Math

3rd-20%

4th-64%

5th-18%

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 100% of students with disabilities will make learning gains and overall achievement will increase from 24% to 45% for ELA and from 27% to 45%.

By October 2023, all ESE push in teachers and ESE Homeroom Teachers will collaborate with the Math Coach and explicitly plan small group instruction for Math and ELA for SWD's as evidence by lesson plans.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will monitor for implementation by conducting data chats, formal/informal observations, collecting lesson plans, participating in PLC's and analyzing work samples/attendance/formative data/summative data and technology use.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Patrick (kelly.a.patrick@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.)

Evidence based intervention for this area of focus include: Small group instruction using SPIRE, Wilson and LLI, morning and afterschool tutoring and adaptive technology programs including iReady and IXL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Incorporating small group instruction utilizing USA and FSQ data to meet the students need for standards based practice and to identify areas of weakness for targeted remediation. Utilizing specific student data has proven success based on state assessment data.
2. IXL and iReady has shown to significantly increase student achievement when used with fidelity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Aligned with the District Strategic Plan Theme, "Committed and Impactful Employees," our Area of Focus is to ensure all new employees have the environment, support, skills, and resources for excellence. Through successful implementation of the Educator Support Program (ESP), new teachers will receive 4 types of support: Physical, Emotional, Instructional, and Institutional. New teachers will be enrolled in the Foundations Course for ESP, and guided through the process by the ESP Contact and Team. New teachers will be paired with a mentor that will assist them during their first year and become a go-to on campus for any type of support. Teacher mentors will support our new educators in all facets of instruction and across all content areas. In addition, through Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and with the support of our Single School Culture Coordinator, teachers will collaboratively plan for instruction to 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 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

It is imperative that new and veteran teachers are kept abreast of Florida Statutes and District Policies, and working with them through the ESP Program will ensure they have that support and information.

Teacher retention is everyone's business, and Meadow Park has assembled a core ESP Team to support these new teachers during their critical first year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the completion of the ESP Program (May 2024), 100% of participants will complete ESP requirements through the use of the Electronic Workbook. Participants will attend at least 6 ESP "Huddles" throughout the year for general discussion, pertinent information, and assignment monitoring.

Administration will validate participation and completion in the ESP Program on District Form 1020. In addition, through PLCs and collaborative planning, 100% of ESP teacher participants will be equipped with the knowledge to 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. We hope to retain 90-100% of our ESP Participants by making them feel supported and a valued member of our Meadow Park Team.

Monitoring:

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

All ESP Participants will complete at Electronic Workbook to monitor progress towards assignments and goals. In addition, all Mentors will complete Mentor Logs to demonstrate completion of mentor sessions. Lesson plans and PLC Agendas will be reviewed and monitored by administration to determine evidence of required instruction of Florida State Statute 1003.42 and SB Policy 2.09. Finally, ESP Huddles will serve as monitoring checkpoints for all new teachers to determine what further supports may be needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cassandra White (cassandra.white@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.)

In addition to the support given by the ESP Team and ESP Mentor, if new teachers are in need of further supports, the ESP Contact can deploy the assistance of the Academic Coach, Single School Culture Coordinator, or District Support Personnel.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing a whole-school approach to teacher onboarding, the new teachers will feel supported and valued. Coaching, open and consistent communication, timely/meaningful feedback, and relationship building are all strategies shown to assist in teacher retention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

1. Resource teachers (ESOL and ESE) support during small group instruction.
2. Teachers and support staff will attend ongoing professional development to engage deep, focused, collaborative planning to support and strengthen data analysis and small group planning and implementation.
3. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices.
4. Instructional Math Coach will provide teachers with a variety of levels of support to ensure teacher development and growth.
5. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework to ensure students are provided with the specific researched based instruction, resources, time, and intensity needed for academic success.
6. Curriculum resources to enhance ELA and Math skills to support student mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. standards, will support literacy across the content areas, will support social emotional growth through the resources found in the SLL Resource Center to promote character education.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

All Title I schools in SDPBC are required to complete a Schoolwide Plan (SWP) where the answers to these questions are addressed. This information is located on the District Title 1 website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A