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## Lantana Elementary School

710 W OCEAN AVE, Lantana, FL 33462
https://lane.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. $6311(\mathrm{~b})(2)(\mathrm{C})(\mathrm{v})(\mathrm{II})$; 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 evidencebased 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 |  | $6 \mathrm{~A}-1.099827(4)(\mathrm{a})(1)$ |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement <br> \& SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) |  |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | $6 \mathrm{~A}-1.099827(4)(\mathrm{a})(2)$ |
| II-A-C: Data Review | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | $6 \mathrm{~A}-1.099827(4)(\mathrm{a})(2)$ |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) |  |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), <br> $(7)(A)(i i i)(I-V)(B) ~$ <br> ESSA 1116(b-g) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | VI: Title I Requirements |  |

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 parents, staff and community of our school will provide a safe, nurturing, and equitable education that meets the social, academic and physical needs of each student so that all students will be successful learners and productive citizens who are college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.
Lantana Elementary School envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and 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 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Robinson, <br> Janyn | Principal | Maintain focus and support in academic, social and behavioral needs, <br> provide instructional feedback, coaching, with teachers, data analysis and <br> monitoring of student academic needs. |
| Rossello, <br> Celena | Assistant <br> Principal | Maintain focus and support in academic, social and behavioral needs, <br> provide instructional feedback, coaching, with teachers, data analysis and <br> monitoring of student academic needs. |

Campbell, Administrative
Elaina Support

Provides teacher classroom support, instructional resources, coaching, feedback, and monitoring of instructional practices. Focus on ELA. Also, monitors the SLL integration across content areas.
Ebner, Math Coach Teaches AMP, supports teachers with math instruction.
Shannon

Keene,
Ashley
Other Teachers ELLs and also supports teachers.

## 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.

We included all stakeholders. Teachers and staff were presented with FY23 data to engage in a data analysis, brainstorm goals (WIGs) and action steps. This process was replicated with the Leadership Team in the beginning of September. This process was also done with parents and community members during the School Advisory Council Meeting.

## 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 in a variety of ways. Data will be reviewed monthly during both Leadership Team Meetings as well as PLCs. Also, there will be periodic data chats with Admin, teachers, \& instructional coaches. Furthermore, three times per year we will have Individual Data and Instructional Next step discussions between content area teacher and the Resource Teachers that work with the students. This will support students with the greatest achievement gap, as we work to make sure all students reach the SIP goals. We will also present updates to the School Advisory Council. Finally, we will engage in the continuous improvement model as we monitor for effective implementation during Leadership Team Meetings, PLCs, data chats.

## 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 | 87\% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100\% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented <br> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) <br> English Language Learners (ELL) <br> Black/African American Students (BLK) <br> Hispanic Students (HSP) <br> White Students (WHT) <br> Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History <br> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2021-22: C } \\ & \text { 2019-20: C } \\ & \text { 2018-19: } \mathrm{C} \\ & \text { 2017-18: } \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ |

## 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 | 27 | 20 | 23 | 13 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 33 | 42 | 60 | 24 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 27 | 37 | 47 | 29 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 50 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 |

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 |  | K | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 30 | 35 | 54 | 31 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 |

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

|  | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 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 | 33 | 39 | 25 | 40 | 21 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA | 26 | 46 | 36 | 56 | 23 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 |
| Course failure in Math | 16 | 37 | 31 | 37 | 26 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 21 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 29 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 42 | 0 | 0 |  | 83 |

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

| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students with two or more indicators | 22 | 41 | 31 | 55 | 31 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |

## 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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | 33 | 39 | 25 | 40 | 21 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA | 26 | 46 | 36 | 56 | 23 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 |
| Course failure in Math | 16 | 37 | 31 | 37 | 26 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 21 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 29 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |

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

| Indicator |  | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 22 | 41 | 31 | 55 | 31 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |

The number of students identified retained:

|  | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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* | 36 | 53 | 53 | 39 | 59 | 56 | 34 |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains |  |  |  | 65 |  |  | 38 |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile |  |  |  | 57 |  |  | 40 |  |  |
| Math Achievement* | 46 | 57 | 59 | 42 | 53 | 50 | 31 |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains |  |  |  | 65 |  |  | 32 |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |  |  |  | 45 |  |  | 22 |  |  |
| Science Achievement* | 48 | 54 | 54 | 36 | 59 | 59 | 21 |  |  |
| Social Studies Achievement* |  |  |  |  | 66 | 64 |  |  |  |
| Middle School Acceleration |  |  |  |  | 54 | 52 |  |  |  |
| Graduation Rate |  |  |  |  | 47 | 50 |  |  |  |
| College and Career Acceleration |  |  |  |  |  | 80 |  |  |  |
| ELP Progress | 70 | 56 | 59 | 66 |  |  | 35 |  |  |

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

## ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41\% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 235 |
| 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 | 52 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41\% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 415 |
| 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 <br> Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | $\begin{gathered} \text { Subgroup } \\ \text { Below } \\ 41 \% \end{gathered}$ | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41\% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32\% |
| SWD | 34 | Yes | 1 |  |
| ELL | 44 |  |  |  |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 45 |  |  |  |
| HSP | 49 |  |  |  |
| MUL |  |  |  |  |
| PAC |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 41 |  |  |  |


| 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\% |
| FRL | 47 |  |  |  |


| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ESSA <br> Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | $\begin{gathered} \text { Subgroup } \\ \text { Below } \\ 41 \% \end{gathered}$ | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41\% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32\% |
| SWD | 47 |  |  |  |
| ELL | 53 |  |  |  |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 50 |  |  |  |
| HSP | 55 |  |  |  |
| MUL |  |  |  |  |
| PAC |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 51 |  |  |  |
| FRL | 51 |  |  |  |

## 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 <br> Ach. | ELA LG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELA LG } \\ & \text { L25\% } \end{aligned}$ | Math Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci <br> Ach. | SS Ach. | MS <br> Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2021-22 \end{gathered}$ | C \& C Accel 2021-22 | ELP <br> Progress |
| All Students | 36 |  |  | 46 |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  | 70 |
| SWD | 27 |  |  | 29 |  |  | 30 |  |  |  | 5 | 69 |
| ELL | 28 |  |  | 43 |  |  | 43 |  |  |  | 5 | 70 |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 33 |  |  | 44 |  |  | 44 |  |  |  | 5 | 74 |
| HSP | 37 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  | 5 | 63 |
| MUL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 2022-23 AcCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELA LG } \\ & \text { L25\% } \end{aligned}$ | Math Ach. | Math LG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Math } \\ & \text { LG } \\ & \text { L25\% } \end{aligned}$ | Sci <br> Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2021-22 \end{gathered}$ | C \& C <br> Accel <br> 2021-22 | ELP <br> Progress |
| PAC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 46 |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| FRL | 33 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  | 5 | 70 |


| 2021-22 AcCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | ELA LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Math Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Math } \\ & \text { LG } \\ & \text { L25\% } \end{aligned}$ | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2020-21 \end{gathered}$ | C \& C Accel 2020-21 | ELP <br> Progress |
| All <br> Students | 39 | 65 | 57 | 42 | 65 | 45 | 36 |  |  |  |  | 66 |
| SWD | 29 | 68 | 68 | 33 | 53 | 50 | 25 |  |  |  |  | 52 |
| ELL | 33 | 70 | 67 | 40 | 73 | 50 | 27 |  |  |  |  | 66 |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 36 | 59 | 53 | 39 | 68 | 50 | 33 |  |  |  |  | 61 |
| HSP | 40 | 70 | 70 | 44 | 63 |  | 29 |  |  |  |  | 72 |
| MUL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 48 | 60 |  | 44 | 60 |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 37 | 66 | 57 | 39 | 63 | 45 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 67 |


| 2020-21 AcCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | ELA LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Math Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2019-20 \end{gathered}$ | C \& C Accel 2019-20 | ELP <br> Progress |
| All <br> Students | 34 | 38 | 40 | 31 | 32 | 22 | 21 |  |  |  |  | 35 |
| SWD | 22 | 28 | 33 | 30 | 29 | 15 | 21 |  |  |  |  | 30 |
| ELL | 28 | 47 | 58 | 23 | 31 | 30 | 14 |  |  |  |  | 35 |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 31 | 40 |  | 26 | 37 |  | 11 |  |  |  |  | 37 |
| HSP | 34 | 44 |  | 37 | 29 |  | 32 |  |  |  |  | 35 |
| MUL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 42 | 10 |  | 35 | 30 |  | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 30 | 36 | 40 | 27 | 32 | 22 | 19 |  |  |  |  | 35 |

## 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.

| Grade | ELA |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | School | District | School- <br> District <br> Comparison | State | School- <br> State <br> Comparison |  |
| 05 | $2023-$ Spring | $45 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $-11 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $-9 \%$ |
| 04 | $2023-$ Spring | $37 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $-21 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $-21 \%$ |
| 03 | $2023-$ Spring | $31 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $-17 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $-19 \%$ |


| Grade | Year | School | District | SATH <br> School- <br> District <br> Comparison | State | School- <br> State <br> Comparison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03 | $2023-$ Spring | $41 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $-16 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $-18 \%$ |
| 04 | $2023-$ Spring | $32 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $-20 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $-29 \%$ |
| 05 | $2023-$ Spring | $61 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $6 \%$ |


| SCIENCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Year | School | District | SchoolDistrict Comparison | State | SchoolState Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 43\% | 51\% | -8\% | 51\% | -8\% |

## 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:
Grade Level FY22 FY23 PM3
ELA
3 29\% 30\%
4 39\% 37\%
5 44\% 45\%
SWD 29\% 24\%
ELL 33\% 26\%
Black 36\% 39\%

Hispanic 40\% 32\%
White 48\% 44\%
FRL 37\% 34\%
Math
3 41\% 41\%
4 45\% 32\%
5 37\% 61\%
SWD 33\% 28\%
ELL 40\% 40\%
Black 39\% 46\%
Hispanic 44\% 37\%
White 44\% 38\%
FRL 39\% 45\%
Science 5 32\% 43\%
ELA and Math proficiency showed the lowest performance. Proficiency in grades
K-2 remains a necessity as well. 3rd Grade ELA proficiency has the most immediate need based on FY23 ELA Achievement levels. Lantana teachers and admin will continue to monitor and analyze data of FSQs and USAs, and the FAST Progress Monitoring assessments through PLCs and Data chats. There are many contributing factors to last year's low performance. Student attendance continues to be a challenge as well as teacher shortage. Last year was the first year with a new assessment that was computer based which was new to our students as well. These proved to be challenges for our teachers and students to learn the mechanics of testing on a computer.

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

Although in FY22 the students took the FSA and in FY23 the students took the FAST assessment. The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 4th grade Math. There was a $13 \%$ decline in students scoring a level 3 or higher. This decline may be due to the difference in assessments, method in which the assessments were given, and AMP students taking the 5th grade assessment.

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

The component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 4th grade Math. $32 \%$ of students at Lantana Elementary scored a level 3 or higher on Progress Monitoring 3. Whereas $61 \%$ of students in the state of Florida scored a level 3 or higher on Progress Monitoring 3. The difference is 29 percentage points. Student attendance is a challenge at Lantana Elementary. We have also implemented Accelerated Math which decreases our student proficiency in 4th Grade Math as the students in this program take the 5th Grade FAST assessment.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 5th grade Math. Some of the contributing factors to improvement in 5th Grade Math Achievement are students in 4th Grade received AMP instruction, Math data was analyzed in PLCs, additional tutorial provided to students after and during school, and consistent and monitored use of adaptive technology. Math data was consistently analyzed and evidence based strategies were developed during biweekly PLCs. Through the use of ESSER funds, tutorials were provided to students performing below grade level during and after school. Students
consistently used SuccessMaker and Reflex Math with data and time on task being monitored and analyzed consistently and frequently. The school will continue to align it's initiatives and directives to the district's strategic plan. SEL will continue to be implemented $\mathrm{K}-5$, as educating the whole child is imperative to student development.

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

According to the EWS data Lantana Elementary has 197 students that have 2 or more Early Warning Indicators. There are 104 students with less than $90 \%$ attendance for the FY23 school year. This is a significant number of students that will affect student achievement. Student attendance is a direct reflection on student achievement. Other Early Warning indicators that are a concern are the number of students with a failure in ELA and/or Math.
These indicators will be at the forefront of all PLCs to discuss ongoing strategies to remedy these areas.
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 selfcontained 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.

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

Lantana's highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are:

1. Increased Student Achievement
2. Increased Student Attendance

Lantana is implementing the House System based on the Ron Clark Academy. This has proven to increase student/teacher relationships, student belonging and student attendance. Lantana is implementing this system with the expectation of seeing a decline in student absences and an increase in student achievement.

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.
If all teachers engage in consistent and effective literacy instruction in PreK-3rd grade classrooms then the school will increase reading on grade level by 3rd Grade and will ensure all students engage in teaching and learning that results in academic excellence. Research indicates the biggest impact to student achievement is teacher effectiveness. Therefore, effective instructional practice will be the key to student achievement. Teachers will provide instruction that addresses the full intent and is aligned to the standards.
According to FY23 FAST data, ELA Achievement overall is at $37 \%$ and therefore is a critical need for improvement.
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 to 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.

## Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
By May 2024, 75\% of our students will make at least one year's growth in Reading as measured by state assessments.

## Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
ELA Achievement will be monitored through Progress Monitoring Assessments provided by the State FAST assessment, iReady, and District FSQs and USAs. This data will be reviewed in PLCs by teachers, administration, the SSCC, and PLC Facilitator. Administration and teachers will engage in data chats. Teachers
and students will engage in data chats as well.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janyn Robinson (janyn.robinson@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 following evidence based strategies will be implemented:

1. PLC cycles that focus on standard based core instruction strategies
2. Differentiated small group instruction
3. Utilization of adaptive technology
4. Professional Development and strategic planning to support the implementation of evidence based interventions and programs
5. Continued implementation of TopScore for grades 3-5

## Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. PLCs offer the opportunity to plan rigorous instruction with the guidance of administration and instructional coaches. During PLCs teachers will use trends in student data and work samples to identify learning needs in order to adjust instruction.
2. Small group instruction provides students with individualized instruction to meet their varying reading
needs as well as an opportunity to provide corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.
3. Adaptive technology provides yet another opportunity for students to receive instruction that is individualized to their specific needs.
4. Professional Development provides support to teachers to be able to deliver content, concepts or skills that are aligned to the benchmark and intended learning. Teachers will be able to implement evidence and standards based instruction with fidelity.
5. TopScore provides a rigorous Writing curriculum for students in grades 3-5.

## 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.
Plan engaging and meaningful PLCs to meet the needs of teachers. Grade level/content specific groups will meet on a regularly scheduled basis. The agenda includes input from the teachers and includes some standing items, such as welcoming ritual, data review, planning, commitments.
Person Responsible: [no one identified]
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.
Help teachers develop and plan for effective small group instruction. Planning for small group instruction requires data analysis, planning of the groupings and schedule, using vetted resources to teach and practice strategies during small group instruction. Finally, planning a way to assess the learning within the small group is important for adjusting instruction to ensure student mastery.
Person Responsible: Elaina Campbell (elaina.campbell@palmbeachschools.org)
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.
Monitor the use of adaptive technology. Teachers review reports regularly, including during PLCs.
Teachers and Admin review passing data percentages, discuss with students, and develop grade level strategies to maintain the passing percentage expectations for students and the school.
Person Responsible: Celena Rossello (celena.rossello@palmbeachschool.org)
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.
Plan and provide meaningful professional development to support teachers. Teachers give input through a survey of desired PD to improve their instructional practice. The PD Team reviews the data, determines PD topics, and arranges for the sessions.
Person Responsible: Elaina Campbell (elaina.campbell@palmbeachschools.org)
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.
Monitor the implementation of TopScore Writing in grades 3-5.
Person Responsible: Elaina Campbell (elaina.campbell@palmbeachschools.org)
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.

## \#2. 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.
Research shows that creating a classroom/school environment that acts intentionally to lower the affective filter of students, increases student achievement. Students who are highly motivated, feel confident and safe acquire more knowledge. Therefore, if we provide a positive and supportive school climate then we will ensure the social, emotional, and academic development of all students. This aligns with the school district's strategic plan to enhance a sense of belonging, safety, and acceptance for all students.

The school's attendance data indicates this is an area of critical need.

## Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Lantana Elementary School will consistently ensure a safe and supportive school climate that promotes the social, emotional, and academic development of all students and decrease absences by $20 \%$.

## Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Monitoring will take place through attendance data in SiS. PLC's will also provide a platform for teachers to plan for strategies to increase student attendance.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

## Celena Rossello (celena.rossello@palmbeachschool.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 research based curriculum (Second Step) utilized during Morning and Afternoon meetings, the implementation of a Positive Behavior System daily, the school will implement the House System based on the Ron Clark Academy. Teachers will also complete a referral process and recommend students to School Based Team for academic, social, or emotional needs. The counselors, BHP, and colocated therapist will provide social and emotional instruction to all students and specific support to students who present a more pressing, individualized need.

## Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Utilizing a research based curriculum provides effective social and emotional skills needed for student success.
2. Implementing a Positive Behavior System school wide ensures a Single School

Culture of expectations for a safe learning environment.
3. Referring students to School Based Team for intervention allows the school to determine the best interventions for students to help them succeed.
4. Having counselors, the BHP, and co-located therapist provides needed intervention for social and emotional needs.
5. Implementing the House System provides a safe and engaging environment that is optimal for student achievement.
6. A positive school culture and environment reflects a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in
student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity.
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.
Provide professional development and support to teachers in identifying and providing research based interventions to support students who are exhibiting an academic or behavioral deficiency.
Person Responsible: Celena Rossello (celena.rossello@palmbeachschool.org)
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.
Teachers will monitor student attendance and will complete SBT referrals when needed in order to implement strategies to increase attendance.
Person Responsible: Celena Rossello (celena.rossello@palmbeachschool.org)
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.
Provide daily instruction using Second Step Curriculum in Morning Meeting
Person Responsible: Elaina Campbell (elaina.campbell@palmbeachschools.org)
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.
Teachers and Staff will utilize PBIS initiatives.
Person Responsible: Celena Rossello (celena.rossello@palmbeachschool.org)
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.
Implement the House System schoolwide, to include all students and staff members.
Person Responsible: Janyn Robinson (janyn.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)
By When: This will be an ongoing initiative ending at the end of the school year.
6. 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, and Pacific Islanders
(o) Health Education, Life Skills, and Social Media
(q) Hispanic Contributions
(r) Women's Contributions
(t) Civic and 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.

Person Responsible: Janyn Robinson (janyn.robinson@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: This will be ongoing, ending at the end of the school year.

## Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

## Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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


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

Ensuring all students engage in teaching and learning that results in academic excellence is in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan, Theme A: Academic Excellence and Growth. Therefore, our focus of $75 \%$ of our students making at least one year's growth in ELA is an instructional priority which will be monitored to provide immediate feedback to students that is aligned to the standards. Standards-based Core Instruction continues to be a focus in grades PreK-3 to increase overall proficiency in ELA through effective and consistent literacy instruction. By focusing on standards based core instruction in grades PreK-2, proficiency in grades 3-5 will naturally increase. Teachers use the PLC process to delve into data and plan effective lessons. Resource teachers provide interventions to students performing below grade level.

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 selfcontained 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.

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

Standards-based Core Instruction continues to be a focus in grades 3-5 to increase overall proficiency in ELA. One way this will be achieved is through a double down approach in all 3-5 Literacy classrooms in which our Resource Teachers push-in to provide small group instruction in addition to the classroom teacher. Another strategy the school employs is the use of 2 SAI teachers to provide supplemental academic intervention with a focus on students in grades 3-5. Lantana also provides in school and after school tutorials focusing on our students that have scored below proficiency on statewide assessments. Grades 3-5 classes are departmentalized, this provides an opportunity for teachers to hone their craft in a specific content area and specialize in providing strategies specific to that content to students.

## Measurable Outcomes

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

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


## Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By May 2024, $75 \%$ of our K-2 students will make at least one year's growth in Reading as measured by the
statewide STAR Reading and STAR Early Literacy assessments.
Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes
By May 2024 75\% of our 3-5 students will make at least one year's growth in Reading as measured by the
statewide FAST assessment.

## Monitoring

## Monitoring

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

Monitoring is a key component to improvement. Monitoring data gives administration and teachers the information needed to improve instruction, making it effective and providing differentiation for students. K-2 data will be monitored through data analysis within grade level PLCs of the STAR Progress Monitoring assessments, iReady, and District FSQs and USAs. 3-5 will be monitored through data analysis within content area PLCs of the FAST Progress Monitoring assessments, iReady and District FSQs and USAs. Each grade level will use Oral Reading Records to help determine small group instruction. Teachers will conduct data chats with students and administration will conduct data chats with teachers. Administration will also collect and review data through lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, formal observations, PLC attendance and participation, student attendance, and student work samples.

## Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.
Robinson, Janyn, janyn.robinson@palmbeachschools.org

## Evidence-based Practices/Programs

## Description:

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

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

Evidence based practices and programs improve student outcomes and are important to implement for ELA achievement. The evidence based practices/programs Lantana implements meet Florida's definition of
evidence based and align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence based Reading Plan as well as
the B.E.S.T. ELA standards. Evidence based practices and programs implemented at Lantana Elementary
include:

1. Reading Recovery
2. Leveled Literacy Intervention
3. Voyager
4. SPIRE
5. Small Group Instruction
6. Professional Development
7. PLCs

## Rationale:

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

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

1. Reading Recovery - early Reading intervention instruction provided to 1st grade students on a one to one
basis who are performing below grade level by highly trained teachers
2. Leveled Literacy Intervention - Literacy intervention provided to K-5 students that are performing below
grade level
3. Voyager - Literacy intervention provided to K-5 students that are performing a year or less below grade
level
4. SPIRE - Phonological Awareness and Phonics intervention provided to K-5 students that are performing
below grade level who's literacy need is in Phonics and Phonological Awareness
5. Small Group Instruction - differentiated instruction provided to support all learners
6. Professional Development - teachers participate in ongoing professional development to hone their craft
of providing effective instruction
7. PLCs - teachers collaborate twice monthly to analyze data and plan best practices as a team

## Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning


## Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring
The school has an Academic Success Committee which includes key members such as the SSCC, Media Specialist, Resource Teachers and a grade level teacher representative. This committee implements school wide events and activities to promote Literacy across the school and all stakeholders. This focus of promoting Literacy is important in motivating and getting across the importance of Literacy to students.

Ahmed, Uzma, uzma.ahmed@palmbeachschools.org

Literacy Modeling and Coaching is provided primarily by the SSCC. In addition, highly effective Resource Teachers, homeroom teachers and the PLC Facilitator provide modeling and coaching to their peers. The coaching cycle in which observing, modeling, coaching and feedback is implemented whenever coaching takes place.

Campbell, Elaina,
elaina.campbell@palmbeachschools.org

Classroom teachers assess students frequently. This data is then used during PLCs and Grade Level meetings to inform instruction and plan effective lessons. Classroom and Resource Teachers administer progress monitoring assessments to students who are receiving intervention. Statewide assessments are overseen by the Assistant Principal and provide another piece of progress monitoring to inform effective, standard aligned instruction.

Rossello, Celena, celena.rossello@palmbeachschool.org

Campbell, Elaina,
elaina.campbell@palmbeachschools.org

The Professional Development Team, which is made up of key members such as an ELL Teacher, the PLC Facilitator and ELL Coordinator survey teachers for specific Professional Development needs. Based on this data, Professional Development is provided in house and by District Specialists during PLCs, faculty meetings, and on District provided Professional Development Days. Teachers also attend District Literacy Cadres and other Literacy Professional Development.

## 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))

NA
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))

NA
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))

NA

