

The School District of Palm Beach County

Pine Grove Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pine Grove Elementary School

400 SW 10TH ST, Delray Beach, FL 33444

<https://pges.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 parents, staff, and community of Pine Grove will provide a safe, nurturing, and equitable educational environment that meets the social, academic and physical needs of each student so that all students will be successful learners and productive citizens. The student mission statement is: My mission at Pine Grove is for me to come to school every day and on time. I believe in learning and trying my best at what I do. I believe that I am a future leader. I believe my family, community and the nation is counting on me. Failure is not an option, being an average student is not an option. Therefore, when I enter the doors of Pine Grove, and enter the doors of my classroom, I expect nothing less of myself but greatness. BECAUSE I AM GREAT! GOOD BETTER BEST! I WILL NEVER LET IT REST UNTIL MY GOOD BECOMES BETTER AND MY BETTER BECOMES MY BEST!

S – SAFETY FIRST
W – WORK HARD
I – I AM RESPECTFUL
M – MY RESPONSIBILITY

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pine Grove Elementary School is a safe, well, respected community school with happy, healthy, thriving children who are ready to meet the daily challenge of a relevant and rigorous curriculum. Pine Grove students will be provided with differentiated instruction and strategies to meet state and national proficiency standards and/or make significant learning gains in all core academic 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
King, Shauntay	Principal	Shauntay King-Principal-Instructional leader, coaching and providing feedback for teachers, analyzing data to help drive instruction, and provides opportunity for professional development
	Assistant Principal	Christina Caldovino-AP-Instructional leader, coaching and providing feedback for teachers, analyzing data to help drive instruction, and provides opportunity for professional development.
Valentin, Alexis	Other	Alexis Valentin -Reading coach and resource teachers-Provides guidance and support to the teachers and leads PLCs.
Pierre Compere, Jasmine	Other	Jasmine Compere-ELL Coordinator-Provide support to ELL team and assist with small group instruction.
Moses, Stacey	Instructional Coach	Stacey Moses Brown-Learning Team Facilitator,Lead PLC, and provide guidance and support to 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.

Guidance will also use Suite 360 to teach about substance abuse and sex trafficking. The Guidance department and our BHP will also focus on character education to include instruction on developing leadership skills, interpersonal skills, organization skills, and research skills; creating a resume; developing and practicing the skills necessary for employment interviews; conflict resolution, workplace ethics, and workplace law; managing stress and expectations, and developing skills that enable students to become more resilient and self-motivated.

Title X; Homeless; Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI); violence prevention programs; nutrition programs; and Head Start/VPK.

Homeless children have access to the educational and other services that they need to enable them to meet the same challenging state student academic achievement standards to which all students are held. In addition, homeless students may not be separated from the mainstream school environment.

A school district officer is on campus every day for the safety and security of all students and staff. The school has one point of entry for everyone. Fortify Florida Application is on every computer, and students are made aware of this "app" in our assemblies. The "Raptor System" is used to sign parents/visitors before they can go to a classroom, or school event on campus.

Our school ELL population continue to grow so our ESOL Coordinator and ESOL School Counselor work in conjunction with the District's multicultural department to ensure the fidelity of implementation of programs and services designed to improve the outcomes of English Language Learners.

The school integrates School Wide Positive Behavior system to influence academic, climate, and behavior. A social skills behavior matrix has been developed and implemented with staff, parents, and students. The Pine Grove universal guidelines and expectations:

S - Safety First

W- Work Hard

I - I am respectful

M- My responsibility

Community Partners

The Achievement Center for Children and Families (ACCF) is our after-school program. The Director and counselors work closely with the administrative staff to ensure that students are supported.

21st Century After School Program. The Director and counselors work closely with the administrative staff to ensure that students are supported.

Parent Engagement

Throughout the school year, we strive to have our parents involved in various parent engagement activities. Parents are encouraged to come to our School Advisory Council meetings which are held once a month. We also hold Open House/Curriculum night in September. We have also set up two dates for our Dolphin Pride Nights/Report Card Nights. This is where parents, family members, and community members come together and students showcase their work, assessments, and artwork. Our Guidance Department also provides parent training/Parent University opportunities throughout the year to reinforce positive parenting skills.

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))

Assessments include the new Progress Monitoring which will take place three times per year. In VPK-Grade 2 there is Early Literacy/Star Reading, and Star Math. In Grades 3-5 there is FAST Reading and Math. Performance Matters Assessments, Florida Standards Assessments, iReady, and district diagnostics. The annual test administered for ELL students is ACCESS. In addition, the WIDA is used to assess ELL students' proficiency in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Teachers are trained by SSCC's and instructional coaches to analyze data, and plan differentiated instruction based on the data. PLC-professional learning community meetings occur weekly by grade and subject area.

Monitoring will take place throughout the year. We will monitor mastery of grade level standards through the use of Unit Assessments, i-Ready Diagnostic, and FAST Progress Monitoring.

Frequent monitoring will allow us to make adjustments to the instructional focus for reteaching opportunities which allows us to individualize instruction to best meet the needs of our students and increase proficiency and growth.

We strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:

- Review of Lesson Plans and implementation
- Data Analysis and instructional focus calendars
- Classroom walks and constructive feedback
- Student attendance
- Data Chats for teachers as well as students
- Formal Observations
- Professional Learning Communities attendance/participation
- Formative/Summative Assessments

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	96%
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 (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	19	13	10	8	8	5	0	0	0	63	
One or more suspensions	2	3	0	1	4	6	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	30	26	23	36	27	12	0	0	0	154	
Course failure in Math	20	16	20	28	9	4	0	0	0	97	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	11	6	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	14	6	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	44	30	18	0	0	0	92	

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	25	18	18	32	20	9	0	0	0	122

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	1	8	6	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	11	12	8	7	0	0	0	52	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	9	14	34	27	8	0	0	0	92	
Course failure in Math	0	7	10	18	3	5	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	8	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	14	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	37	14	28	0	0	0	79	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	12	20	12	10	0	0	0	63

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	7	6	1	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	11	12	8	7	0	0	0	52	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	9	14	34	27	8	0	0	0	92	
Course failure in Math	0	7	10	18	3	5	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	8	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	14	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	37	14	28	0	0	0	79	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	12	20	12	10	0	0	0	63

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	7	6	1	0	0	0	14
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*	43	53	53	56	59	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				70			73		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			62		
Math Achievement*	61	57	59	65	53	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				73			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			31		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	38	54	54	22	59	59	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	56	59	71			43		

* 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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	235
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	24	Yes	1	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	52			

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	42			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	62			
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	58			

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	43			61			38					55
SWD	18			22							4	42
ELL	34			61							4	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			64			47				5	51
HSP	22			43							4	63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	46			65			45				5	56

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	56	70	57	65	73	52	22					71
SWD	32	57	45	35	52	43	10					63
ELL	52	63	45	71	83		20					71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58	78	71	67	75	53	19					73
HSP	40	38		52	56							62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	56	70	57	65	73	52	22					71

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	49	73	62	43	49	31	37					43
SWD	22	56		12	26	30	0					26
ELL	51	73		44	32		44					43

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49	68		44	53		32					48
HSP	44	82		36	45							19
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	49	74	62	43	50	31	36					43

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	36%	56%	-20%	54%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	58%	-6%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	32%	48%	-16%	50%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	60%	57%	3%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	61%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	51%	-12%	51%	-12%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our FY22 overall ELA proficiency dipped from 53% in FY23 to 42% in FY23. In math we saw a steady trend of 65% overall math proficiency. In 2021 our SWD population had the lowest proficiency in both reading and math. In FY22 19% and in FY23 the percentage was at 27% which was an improvement. There were no gains due to the testing being in a baseline year. In math there was a dip for our SWD. In FY22 it was 35%, which is a great and in FY23 it was 22%. Again new standards and new testing platforms played a role in this. For ELA proficiency for ELL students in FY22 was 47% and decreased to 23% in FY23. In math our ELL students dropped a little with proficiency of 52% in FY22 and 51% in FY23. Our FRL students also dipped down in proficiency. In FY22 the proficiency was 56% and dropped to 43% in FY23. Our Science data increased this year as well from 22.4% proficiency in FY22 to 40% in FY23. The similarities with all the data is that the students were taking a new assessment, taking it on the computer, and taking the assessment three times throughout the year.

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

Our SWD and our ELL students showed the greatest gap in ELA gains this year. The contributing factor for the gap was a lack of teacher capacity as well as standards being new. In FY23, scheduling and personnel was considered in grouping students for targeted instruction. In FY23, modeling and coaching were provided during ELA blocks. In addition, the master schedule provided time for our reading club. This is in addition to iii and allows ESE, ELL, SAI, and other specialized teachers to provide differentiated instruction and target our Low 25% that are moving through SBT. Students are placed in groups based on their needs and provided foundational skills lessons, Oral Language, SPIRE or LLI. They are monitored and assessed on their growth. We also utilized iReady and Benchmark assessments to make decisions from the District decision tree to ensure fidelity and correct intervention for students. The schedule was designed to provide small groups in order to differentiate instruction and increase student engagement. We have a large ELL population and we believe that we have to continuously provide professional development around supporting them. In 1st and 2nd grade there was an increase in ELA from winter to spring. In 3rd and 4th grade there was a decrease in ELA, but an increase in 4th grade math. In 5th grade there was an increase in ELA and a decrease in math.

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 ELA data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Although we dipped down in overall ELA proficiency in our 3-5th grade overall, the greatest gap was our 5th graders. The district 5th graders were at 55% proficient while our 5th grade students performed at 35% (20% difference). The students who performed at 35% this year were the students that were affected by the pandemic. The students struggled when they came back to school and worked hard to close gaps when they returned.

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

Our Science data increased this year as well from 22.4% proficiency in FY22 to 40% in FY23. Strategic planning of the master board to create opportunities for students to have targeted instruction in small

groups contributed to this increase in addition to increasing teacher capacity through PLC, PD, and coaching. We also amped our intervention program along with the district to ensure all students not performing on grade level were receiving supplemental instruction. In FY 24 school year we will restarted small group instruction, focus in on our supplemental services for our decision tree and SBT students. All professional development will be focused around how best to reengage our students to ensure they are being active learners. To address improvement in math, our math coach will continue to provide ongoing PD and utilized PLC time to review the standards based instruction and how it would be presented for students especially during small group time. A progress monitoring tracking tool will be implemented to assist teachers during instruction and will be a guide to help make informed decisions about the type of instruction that will best suit each individual student.

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

1. For the school year FY24. We have added 8 new teachers. Teacher capacity will be an area of concern for ELA proficiency and math proficiency in general. We will support the teachers through increased through PLCs, PD, and coaching. Teachers will engage in PD that focuses around core action two and core action three. The teachers will learn strategies on how to increase students engagement and also accountable talk. There will be opportunity for collaborative planning and data analysis to strengthen their instructional practices to accelerate learning Math, ELA and Science. PLCs will play a huge role in ensuring all subgroups (L25, SWD, ELL, Etc) are accounted for. We are also hoping that since this will be the second year of testing, that our learning gains will show a great improvement.

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

1. In the area of ELA we have taken the masterboard and personnel into consideration when placing students in groups K-5. This is incorporated into the Master Schedule outside of the 90 minute reading block.
2. Our K-2nd ELL and ESE push-in support teachers provide foundational skills through guided reading lessons. Our 3rd-5th grade classes utilize District area support, coaches, and PLCs to plan and also review the content before it is presented to students.
3. Small group instruction which is focused on the core actions - high quality text, rigorous tasks, and academic talk along with reading club and tutorial will aide in improvement of proficiency.
4. Continue to increase math scores through hands on materials, discussion-based teaching, using the CRA intervention (concrete, representational and abstract), after school and Saturday tutorial, increase teacher's content knowledge in all grades, track data through assessments for all levels, especially 3rd-5th and display for teachers, coaches and administration to see and use during PLC's. Coaches will lead PLC's that will provide the support necessary to equip teachers. Rather than remediating we will use different data to determine the critical skills and concepts that students are missing and providing scaffolds that will bridge gaps while teaching the missing skills with precision and efficiency. We will also be introducing AMP math for our 4th graders.
5. Increase Science - Teach more scientific way of thinking, more group activities with hands-on learning, include science tutorial on weekends for 5th grade, Science on wheel, promote more student discussion and group activities.

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

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our FY22 overall ELA proficiency dipped from 53% in FY23 to 42% in FY23. In math we saw a steady trend of 65% overall math proficiency. In 2021 our SWD population had the lowest proficiency in both reading and math. In FY22 19% and in FY23 the percentage was at 27% which was an improvement. There were no gains due to the testing being in a baseline year. In math there was a dip for our SWD. In FY22 it was 35%, which is a great and in FY23 it was 22%. Again new standards and new testing platforms played a role in this. For ELA proficiency for ELL students in FY22 was 47% and decreased to 23% in FY23. In math our ELL students dropped a little with proficiency of 52% in FY22 and 51% in FY23. Our FRL students also dipped down in proficiency. In FY22 the proficiency was 56% and dropped to 43% in FY23. Our Science data increased this year as well from 22.4% proficiency in FY22 to 40% in FY23. We need to increase the students abilities to read and comprehend the science content and assessments as well. The similarities with all the data is that the students were taking a new assessment, taking it on the computer, and taking the assessment three times throughout the year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable goals for FY24 would have to increase from 42% in ELA to at least 60% proficiency. This would align our students with the strategic plan of our 3rd graders reading on grade level. Our Science proficiency as a school, would need to be at least 45% FY24.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will take place in the classroom during classroom observation. Teachers (ESE and ELL included) will also monitor during their push in support and adjust planning as needed in order to reach the scaffold for the students and help them be successful. The teachers will also monitor formative and summative data to help plan and adjust teaching. Data will be reviewed and analyzed during PLC (Principal, AP, Coaches) in order to adjust questioning and ensure the rigor of the standard is being reached during instructional time. There will be science PLC as well to ensure teachers of all grade levels are able to implement science lessons with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shauntay King (shauntay.king@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Students will be remediated and enriched during ELA through use of Benchmark, the i-Ready, LLI, SPIRE, and differentiated instruction to include double downs (phonemic awareness, guided reading, strategy groups, close reading).
2. ESE and ESOL teachers will participate in PLCs and PD around planning and providing relative instruction to all students including our SWDs and ELLs. Specifically, the FCIM model:
3. How to teach effectively and ensure that students are learning (utilizing the programs listed above).
4. How do we know students are learning (monitoring and aggressive monitoring training).

5. What to do when students are not learning
(SSCC and coaches)-will assist and model

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention program provides daily, intensive, small-group instruction. LLI turns struggling readers into successful readers with engaging leveled books. SPIRE addresses foundational skills in order to close gaps.
2. iReady adjusts its questions to suit your the students needs. Each item a student sees is individualized based on their answer to the previous question. The program has an online toolbox that teachers can access to pull specific materials that address the individual needs of the students.
3. The Florida Benchmark Advance curriculum is grounded in the science of reading. Foundational skill standards are covered in systematic lessons that develop essential background knowledge and content vocabulary.
4. Double Down is a co teaching strategy that supports students learning at their ability with the guidance and facilitation of a variety of educators. It can be ESOL, ESE resource teachers or led any the Gen Ed classroom teacher.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Teachers will receive PD from District or in-house coaches/mentors, which will build capacity of the teacher and broaden their knowledge base. ESE/ESOL teachers will participate in PD around planning and providing relative instruction to all students including our SWD.
2. Resource teachers participate in rotational schedule of PLCs so that it builds their knowledge base and they can utilize strategies taught in their classes.
3. Resources teachers participate in planning PD days to build their capacity.
4. Science resource teacher will plan and train staff through science PLC's to ensure staff is able to implement lessons.
5. Monitoring will occur through classroom observations and data analysis (Principal, AP, Coaches).

Person Responsible: Shauntay King (shauntay.king@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through the school year and adjusted as we analyze several data points.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In alignment to the District's Strategic Plan, we enhance a sense of belonging, safety, and acceptance for all students. Our instructional priority is to use trends in student data to identify needs in order to support positive behaviors. We will focus on academics, attendance and our PBS systems to continue to support and help our students to reach their full potential.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on our Area of Focus, we will reduce the the amount of suspensions by 10% by December 2023 and by another 10% by May of 2024.

The teachers will utilize our PBS systems and positive reinforcement tools such as the Dolphin Points. They will reteach expectations as well.

By December 2023, 80% of our teachers will positively reinforce student behaviors using Pine Grove systems.

By March 2024, 95% of our teachers will positively reinforce student behaviors using Pine Grove systems

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor several data points for the desired outcome through: Classroom observation, Scheduled pulling of Tutorial data (attendance), Scheduled pulling of Attendance data, Scheduled pulling of Suspension data, student Formative Assessment results, pulling Dolphin points for positive reinforcements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Guidance will utilize character Development and traits through guidance classes.
2. School wide attendance plan
3. School Wide Discipline Plan-which consists of our SWIM expectations
- 4.SWPBS systems
5. Parent Involvement
6. Required Instruction- Florida State Statute 1003.42 and Policy 2.09

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- 1.Character development-Students will learn character development such as responsibility, empathy, in order to understand and respect others.
2. Schoolwide Attendance Plan: An attendance plan will ensure all stakeholders understand the expectations and can collaborate to support all students to be in school on time and ready to learn.
3. SWPBS: supports the decrease of levels of disruptiveness, rates of office referrals, and suspensions. To improve school climate, safety, and order.
4. Parent Involvement in schools improves student attendance, social skills, and behavior. It helps children adapt better in school.

7. Required Instruction 1003.42 and Policy 2.09: 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.

SWPBS

Provide teachers with professional development to understand CHAMPS/SWPBS

Ensure all expectations are clearly explained and understood

Develop a buddy/peer support system of experienced and new teachers to ensure proper mentoring and coaching

Ensure the school has postings of the SWPBS expectations in all common areas and in classrooms

Monitor executions and implementation with fidelity.

Cafeteria assemblies are conducted to review expectations

b. Teachers reinforce expected behaviors in and out of the class through positive rewards.

c. Trimester celebrations are held-pep rallies.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: SWPBS is an ongoing process. The teachers will be trained 100% by September 2023.

Discipline data will be reviewed in December 2023.

Policy 2.09 and Required Instruction Florida State Statute 1003.42

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

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: Erica Thicklin (erica.thicklin@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Our guidance department and media specialist work together throughout the year to ensure that required instruction is taught by May 2024.

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

The focus for our K-2 students is to continue to provide and support standards-based instruction in our classrooms. Ensuring the support of our teachers and guidance, should help reach the goal to increase overall K-2 proficiency school-wide in ELA. By creating a master schedule to provide this support in K-2, the result will also be an increased student proficiency in 3rd grade and ensure alignment to the District Strategic Plan, Theme 1

Academic Excellence and Growth. Our instructional priority is to monitor student understanding and provide corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

According to the data, the students are not entering third grade prepared for the state assessment and for the rigors of the B.E.S.T. standards. According to PM3 FY 23 data 53% of our incoming third grade students are reading on-grade level data. iReady also shows that our overall primary grades proficiency is low in some of our K-2 classrooms.

iReady data:

K-56%

1st-61%

2nd-56%

This data also supports a lack of foundational skills, phonics, and vocabulary.

For PM 1-3 data we saw an upward trend and then a slight drop for K and 1, but a continued increase for 2nd grade students.

PM1 PM2 PM3

K 33% 47% 42.6%

1 44% 33% 20%

2 36% 48% 53%

This data also showed that finding meaning (vocab) was a weakness as well as poetry and prose.

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

If we focus on Standards-based instruction to increase overall 3-5 proficiency school-wide in ELA, then we will increase student proficiency in all students to ensure alignment to the District Strategic Plan, Theme 1 Academic Excellence and Growth. Our instructional priority is to monitor student understanding and provide corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

The data below demonstrates the proficiency achievement levels of all our tested grade levels in ELA.

PM1 PM2 PM3
 3 35% 38% 32%
 4 44% 56% 52%
 5 44% 56% 36%

The data below demonstrates the proficiency achievement levels of all our tested grade levels in ELA by sub groups.

ELL
 PM1 PM2 PM3
 3-5 27% 31% 23%

SWD
 PM1 PM2 PM3
 3-5 32% 28% 15%

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

The measurable outcomes for our K-2 students will be:
 Continuous growth monitored through iReady and PM assessments
 Measurable outcomes by May 2024:
 60% proficiency for ELA
 70% learning gains

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The measurable outcomes for our 3-5 students will be:
 Continuous growth monitored through iReady and PM assessments
 Measurable outcomes by May 2024:
 60% proficiency for ELA
 70% learning gains

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 will occur through ELA PLC for each grade level weekly. At PLC we will review iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring checks, oral records, and end of unit assessments from the Benchmark Series.

We will also use grade level USAs to track growth within standards.

We will also go over lesson plans, implementation of lessons, classroom walks, student evidence samples, data chats, and formal observations.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

King, Shauntay, shauntay.king@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 evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

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

1. Small group instruction: Teachers as well as supplemental support teachers will provide strategically, differentiated instructional support for all student learners. In K-2 there will be a strong phonics based system utilizing Benchmark and Heggerty Phonics. In addition to Benchmark, 3-5 grade will also utilize i Ready Comprehension from the consumables during small group.

2. Professional Development: Teachers and support staff will attend ongoing professional development to

collaborative plan, support and strengthen data analysis and small group lesson implementation.

3. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies. PD will support the development of teacher expertise and instructional strategy success and focus. This work will be supported by our SSCC and reading coaches.

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. Utilize small group instruction, double downs, using i Ready/PM1 data to meet the students need for foundational skill practice and to identify potential areas of weakness for response to intervention. Continue to monitor the growth through assessments and make changes as needed. Small groups make it easy for teachers to provide students a one-on-one opportunity, to observe and provide immediate feedback. Students take personalized feedback and apply it during whole class instruction so that there are improved student outcomes.

2. Teachers will receive ongoing PD through District training to help them plan, organize, and implement consistent and differentiate learning for all students. Teachers will remediate and enrich their students. It also fosters a positive and inclusive learning culture, where students feel valued, respected, and motivated. By differentiating instruction and assessment, teachers can enhance the quality and effectiveness of your teaching and learning.

3. PLCs allow teachers and leadership an opportunity to collaborate, to analyze data, and to make decisions to improve student achievement and progress. It also supports teacher in collaboration with best teaching strategies. The process will allow teachers to match instructional resources to each students educational need. PLCs allow educators opportunities to directly improve teaching and learning. PLCs allow teachers an easy way to share best practices and brainstorm innovative ways to improve learning and drive student achievement.

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
<p>Literacy Leadership</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The master schedule is created to allow for support in reading. 2. The SSCC and the reading coach are also an integral part of the planning and also provide small group instruction for students. The SSCC and reading coach will create an ongoing PD session that consist of mandatory and voluntary sessions that teachers will attend. 3. We also utilize Double Downs, which is a co-teaching strategy that supports students learning, at their ability, with the guidance and facilitation of a variety of educators. It can be ESOL, ESE resource teachers or led by any of the Gen Ed classroom teachers. 4. The leadership team, which includes the SSCC and reading coach, develop a plan to monitor the implementation, ensure compliance with the reading plan. They also have time in their schedules to conduct coaching walks to monitor and support reading instruction. 	<p>King, Shauntay, shauntay.king@palmbeachschools.org</p>
<p>Interventions (Assessment / Professional Learning)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework is in place to ensure students are provided with the specific instruction, resources, time, and intensity needed for success. The SBT team meets weekly to review data and make changes as needed. 2. The team uses the K-5 Reading intervention with guidelines for schools to determine students' needs. The team also takes into account the teacher's feedback and suggestions. 3. Students will be assessed using FAST K-2 STAR, FAST 3-5 Cambium iReady, Benchmark Unit Assessments and USAs in Language Arts. 4. Teachers will analyze student data to determine strengths and weaknesses in content area. This will help in planning for remediation. 	

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

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A