Marsh Pointe Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Marsh Pointe Elementary

12649 IBIIZA DR, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418

https://mpes.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 faculty and staff of Marsh Pointe Elementary School are committed to providing a safe, positive, and rigorous learning environment that will lay the foundation for future success and help to create ethical, responsible, and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is Marsh Pointe's vision to increase student achievement as well as the students' ability to think critically about and apply reasoning and logic skills to solve real-life problems within and between subject areas.

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
Scott, Ryan	Principal	Principal- Instructional leader in charge of executing and monitoring personnel, resources, and strategies to ensure all students receive effective standards-based instruction.
Hantman, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Lauren Hantman - Assistant Principal- Instructional leader in charge of executing and monitoring personnel, resources, and strategies to ensure all students receive effective standards-based instruction.
Innerst, Lisa	Teacher, ESE	ASD teacher who supports schoolwide PLCs and ensuring all teachers are analyzing data to drive instruction. Additionally, she is in charge of supporting the teams with lesson planning utilizing targeted strategies and resources to support student learning and achievement.
gallucci, michael	Teacher, K-12	Third grade teacher and PLC facilitator in charge of ensuring all 3rd grade ELA teachers are analyzing data to drive instruction. Additionally, he is in charge of supporting the team with lesson planning utilizing targeted strategies and resources to support student learning and achievement.
Lipscher, Toni	Instructional Media	Coordinates Fine Arts team and academic instruction in relation to The History of the Holocaust, The History of Black and African Americans, The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics, The Contributions of Women, and The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History. Vets schoolwide materials for all teachers to support instruction.
LaRock, Suzanne	Teacher, K-12	School-Based Team leader-coordinates MTSS supports for struggles students Supplemental Academic Instructor supports and instruction 1st and 2nd-grade struggling readers.

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.

Leadership team meets to review data and develop SIP. SIP is then shared at staff meeting and SAC meeting with parents and 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 be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students through monthly leadership meetings. The team will review schoolwide data and track growth towards targets.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	26%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	

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	15	18	14	14	13	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	12	17	19	5	12	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	4	11	20	5	6	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	2	5	4	1	0	0	0	13

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	4	14	17	4	10	0	0	0	49

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	19	18	19	22	21	24	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	2	7	17	7	10	2	0	0	0	45
Course failure in Math	1	3	3	3	4	2	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	4	6	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	14	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	1	8	7	9	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	1	3	5	9	9	10	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	19	18	19	22	21	24	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions		1	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA		2	7	17	7	10	2	0	0	0	45
Course failure in Math		1	3	3	3	4	2	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	4	6	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	14	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	1	8	7	9	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	1	3	5	9	9	10	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	81	53	53	85	59	56	85		
ELA Learning Gains				75			80		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			65		
Math Achievement*	86	57	59	89	53	50	86		
Math Learning Gains				70			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			48		
Science Achievement*	68	54	54	65	59	59	72		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	71	56	59	84			63		

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	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	603
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	49			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	51			
HSP	73			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	74			

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	50			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	58			
HSP	72			

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	76			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	72			

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	81			86			68					71
SWD	59			61			10				4	
ELL	65			77							3	71
AMI												
ASN	95			95							2	
BLK	38			63							2	
HSP	74			80			58				5	73
MUL	72			88							2	
PAC												
WHT	84			89			71				4	
FRL	70			78			65				4	

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	85	75	62	89	70	73	65					84
SWD	54	52	43	64	57	62	21					
ELL	66	65		83	71		55					84
AMI												
ASN	100	82		100	76							

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	50	60		63	60							
HSP	74	72	56	82	74	74	66					81
MUL	83	75		83	63							
PAC												
WHT	89	76	62	92	70	73	64					
FRL	73	71	71	81	74	82	50					

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	85	80	65	86	59	48	72					63
SWD	54			59								
ELL	73			91								63
AMI												
ASN	93			97								
BLK	63			56								
HSP	79	73		86	60		56					60
MUL	87			83								
PAC												
WHT	86	80	68	87	57	46	71					
FRL	78	74		78	44	36	66					

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	76%	56%	20%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	58%	27%	58%	27%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	88%	48%	40%	50%	38%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	98%	54%	44%	54%	44%
03	2023 - Spring	92%	57%	35%	59%	33%
04	2023 - Spring	87%	52%	35%	61%	26%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	56%	24%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	51%	17%	51%	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.

Based on our data trends from 2021-22, our focus was to increase learning gains and achievement for grades 3-5 in addition to focusing on the needs of our students with disabilities and English language learners. MPE
utilizes data from statewide FAST assessments, Unit assessments, iReady, and Reflex math. Progress monitoring also allows teachers and administrators to track students' academic progress or growth across the entire school year. Teachers use student performance data to continually evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching and make more informed instructional decisions. If the rate at which a particular student is learning seems insufficient, the teacher can adjust instruction. Various reports will be used to monitor and support student learning:
Grades K-2 we will use iReady and FAST assessments for Fall, Winter & Spring
In grades 3-5 we will use iReady and FAST assessments for Fall, Winter and Spring

iReady: Provides user-friendly dashboards and clear reports with actionable data that give teachers a foundational understanding of students' strengths and areas of need.

Unit Standardized Assessments USAs gives teachers data on how well the students have mastered the standard. Supports the monitoring of student learning and provides ongoing feedback that instructors can use to make adjustments to instruction to improve student learning.

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

In FY22, our state science achievement dropped from 72% to 65% overall proficiency. Last year, our science proficiency increased to 68%. This was due, in part, to the lack of hands-on experiences in science due to curricular resources and limited time in implementing these experiences in the classroom. In addition, COVID exacerbated the situation with students coming back from remote learning, social distancing regulations, etc.

All in person learning has resumed which will enable MPE to target the students illustrated in the data previously shared in this school improvement plan in order to provide targeted remediation in order to close the gaps between students who were virtual and those that came to school in FY20.

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.

In all subject areas, Marsh Pointe surpassed the district and state proficiency percentage by double digits.

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

Our math learning gains increased from 59% to 70% in FY22, and our learning gains for the lowest 25% increased from 48% to 73%. Marsh Pointe implemented bimonthly PLCs in which teachers analyzed and tracked student data and implemented plans for remediation and small group instruction.

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

Based on the EWS data, the two potential areas of concern are absences and course failures in ELA.

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

1. Ensuring that every student makes at least one year of growth as evidenced by FAST assessment scores.
2. Ensuring that at least 90% of students score at a proficient level by the end of the school year as evidenced by FAST assessment scores.
3. Increasing science achievement to 80%.

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 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.

Increase proficiency in ELA from FY23 which was at 83%.

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

Increase proficiency to 90% or greater in ELA in all grade levels on FY24 FAST.

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

Teachers will plan targeted lessons to remediate and enrich students on skills and strategies in ELA, monitored by administration. Weekly classroom visits of ELA block by administration to ensure follow-through of standards for the reading block and small group instruction. Bi-weekly monitoring by administration of student ELA data (FSQ/ USA/iReady/RRR) Targeted monitoring by administration of students in iii. Conduct individual data chats with teachers. Monitor the fidelity of implementation based on the ELA Benchmark units and accompanying assessments. PLCs will also be monitored to ensure that they further this goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Scott (ryan.scott@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.)

Marsh Pointe will utilize the following evidence-based strategies: Students will utilize Benchmark close reading booklets to respond/analyze/and reflect learning to ELA standards. Providing intervention for all students below grade level in reading for grades K-5. Teachers will deliver differentiated instruction to students while convening
small groups. Differentiated Small-Group Instruction

During professional development days, our staff participates in professional development sessions focused on the Marzano elements, with a special emphasis on our areas of focus. Teachers examine the protocols associated with each element and share best practices around each of them. Teachers present their ideas and take-aways to the staff and share suggestions with each others. Teachers also have opportunities to participate in Learning Walks, in which teachers visit multiple teachers in various grade levels to look for ideas and evidence of the Marzano elements in practice. Teachers take notes and also share feedback with each other.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are research-based and have been shown to increase student and school achievement through a multitude of studies

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.

Infusing Technology into Instruction and utilization of Intervention
Programs with fidelity
A. Students will consistently utilize technology throughout the school year to support remediation and enhancement of their skills.
B. Teachers will receive professional development during PD days, at workshops and with Trailblazers on various technology programs and strategies.
C. Teachers will increase their knowledge and use of technology to enhance instruction and assist in data analysis.
D. Teachers will utilize research-based intervention programs with fidelity to assist in meeting the needs of all students.
E. Teachers will share their knowledge with peers and act as mentors to support meaningful use of technology and intervention programs throughout the school.
F. Teachers will participate in PLCs and implement lessons developed through PLCs.

Person Responsible: Ryan Scott (ryan.scott@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Increase science proficiency on the statewide science assessment, which is at 68%.

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

Increase proficiency to 80% or greater in 5th grade science NGSSS.

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

Teachers will plan targeted lessons to remediate and enrich students on skills and strategies in science, monitored by administration. Weekly classroom visits of science block by administration to ensure follow-through of standards for the science block. Monthly monitoring by administration of student science data. Conduct individual data chats with teachers. Monitor the fidelity of implementation based on the science scope and sequence in Blender and accompanying assessments. In addition, a hands-on science lab has been added to the fine arts rotation and students will conduct experiments and practice observing science skills.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Scott (ryan.scott@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.)

Marsh Pointe will utilize the following evidence-based strategies: Students will keep science journals to respond/analyze/and reflect learning to science standards. Students in 3-5 will utilize Legends of Learning science program to reinforce science concepts. Each year, we disaggregate state test scores and yearlong progress data in science to determine our areas of priority for the following school year. Teachers will utilize data from science quizzes and assessments in Performance Matters during PLCs to plan for reteaching and differentiated instruction. In addition, teachers will incorporate StemScopes curriculum and resources to enhance instruction. The district science specialist will also provide professional development to all teachers in K-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are research-based and have been shown to increase student and school achievement through a multitude of studies. Legends of Learning science allows students to participate in virtual games and practice of skills, which enhances understanding of scientific concepts. The curriculum selected by the district are on state-approved lists and have been shown to increase student achievement.

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.

Infusing Technology into Instruction and utilization of Intervention
Programs with fidelity
A. Students will consistently utilize technology throughout the school year to support remediation and enhancement of their skills.
B. Teachers will receive professional development during PD days.
C. Teachers will increase their knowledge and use of technology to enhance instruction and assist in data analysis.
D. Teachers will participate in PLCs and implement lessons developed through PLCs.

Person Responsible: Ryan Scott (ryan.scott@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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 EWS data indicates that student attendance and course failure in ELA are two areas of priority for Marsh Pointe. We have decided to focus on positive school culture and environment by revamping our schoolwide positive behavior supports program. Students will earn Panther Bucks for demonstrating responsibility, respect, and safety, and by showing great effort in their learning each day. Students will then be able to spend their Panther Bucks in the Paws' Place store to earn prizes for their hard work. This will generate enthusiasm for school and reward gains in learning, hard work, and positive behaviors and choices.

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

By May 2024, we aim to reduce the number of students absent 10% or more days.

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

Scheduled pulling of attendance data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Hantman (lauren.hantman@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.)

SWPBS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Supports the decrease of levels of disruptiveness, rates of office referrals, and suspensions. To improve school climate, safety, and order. To increase instructional time.

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).

N/A - Marsh Pointe is not classified as ATSI, TSI or CSI.