Grove Park Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Grove Park Elementary School

8330 N MILITARY TRL, West Palm Beach, FL 33410

https://gpes.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.

Mission Statement: Grove Park Elementary is committed to guiding students to become advocates of excellence in their own learning. At Grove Park, we strive to customize instruction, infused with technology, for all unique learning styles. We celebrate the whole child, by fostering connections across a range of subjects. Parents, teachers, and students collaborate to further develop knowledge and attitudes that lead to global-mindedness and, college and career readiness.

In addition, Grove Park's mission aligns with the district's overall mission for students and school accountability:
The School District of Palm Beach County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Grove Park's vision aligns with the district's overall vision for student achievement and school accountability: The School District of Palm Beach 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
Mitchell, Marzella	Principal	
Cousins, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
McIntyre, Andrea	Other	Curriculum Development, Scheduling, Data tracking
Lloyd, Whitney	Magnet Coordinator	IB strategies, monitoring aligning instruction with state standards

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 regularly ask for our community stakeholders to be a part of SAC, advertising often to the community.

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap, by engaging in an on-going data disaggregation process with stakeholders and correlating the grade levels and departments.

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	94%
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	0	25	17	15	16	19	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	7	6	10	0	0	0	30
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	24	33	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	29	28	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	14	21	19	32	41	0	0	0	127

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	43	33	32	22	36	28	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	9	3	12	13	9	13	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	10	27	35	26	16	26	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	6	15	25	21	27	25	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	32	35	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	33	29	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	1	43	39	26	0	0	0	123

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	13	19	25	36	43	45	0	0	0	181

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	43	33	32	22	36	28	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	9	3	12	13	9	13	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	10	27	35	26	16	26	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	6	15	25	21	27	25	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	32	35	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	33	29	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	1	43	39	26	0	0	0	123

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	13	19	25	36	43	45	0	0	0	181

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	33	53	53	36	59	56	34		
ELA Learning Gains				51			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			36		
Math Achievement*	45	57	59	45	53	50	33		
Math Learning Gains				67			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			20		
Science Achievement*	17	54	54	45	59	59	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	56	59	74			51		

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	195
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	1	
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	41			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	54			

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	33			45			17					60
SWD	27			25			20				5	63
ELL	34			42			5				5	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			41			17				5	54
HSP	51			51			20				5	62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	32			44			15				5	62

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	36	51	43	45	67	66	45					74
SWD	18	44	44	22	61	54	29					53
ELL	34	43	30	49	70	62	26					74
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	49	43	38	63	64	51					71
HSP	40	46		54	68		30					76
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46			62								
FRL	35	52	42	43	67	71	44					74

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	34	43	36	33	24	20	39					51
SWD	17	29		19	16		17					46
ELL	36	46	42	36	20	10	37					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	33	38	29	19	8	39					49
HSP	47	50		40	35		29					46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34	44	35	33	24	21	39					50

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	27%	56%	-29%	54%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	58%	-22%	58%	-22%
03	2023 - Spring	36%	48%	-12%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	57%	-9%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	28%	56%	-28%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	15%	51%	-36%	51%	-36%

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.

Science displayed the largest low performance within the last year. Contributing factor included new teachers not having the capacity to teach the subject as well as the school lost about four teachers within the year.

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

Science displayed the largest low performance. Contributing factor included new teachers not having the capacity to teach the subject as well as the school lost about four teachers within the year.

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.

many students had a gap in the areas of reading, writing math and science

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

Many areas showed improvement except science which was a certainly a decrease, but we will continue to stay the course with the high yielding strategies

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

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. We will also focus on attendance and being ready academically for school.

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

Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:
(g) History of Holocaust
(h) History of Africans and African Americans
(i) History of Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders
(o) Health Education, Life Skills & Social Media
(q) Hispanic Contributions
(r) Women's Contributions
(t) Civic & Character Education
(u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

2. Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.
3. Our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the art

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 Small Group Instruction

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.

To ensure effective and targeted instruction for success of all students in English
Language Arts increasing reading on grade level by 3rd grade to 75, in grades PreK-5.
When reviewing our school data, we see that our lowest subgroup performance is within
ELA performance. ESSA identified students with disabilities as an area for Targeted
Support & Intervention. Reading provides a direct correlation to performance in other
content areas as well, including Science and Mathematics. While FY21 showed a 3%
improvement in learning gains compared to FY21 as well as a improvement in L25
learning gains, we haven't made significant increases to math with proficiency according to
the district or state average, there is a clear need for targeted interventions in
grades K-5. FY 23, science scores took a massive dip based on teacher capacity and changes but there is
consistency on the grades 3-5, and the emphasis of core instruction and intervention is evident.
The iReady AP3 results continue to show a significant need in the areas of vocabulary and
phonics which parallels with the reading scores of students entering the next grade level.
We will have to We will provide the scaffolding necessary for students to access grade level content in
order to make progress and move towards proficiency. There will also be more of a concentration in the
areas of phonics and phonemic awareness in all grade levels as this remains a huge problem for students
in grades 3-5 as well.
In PreK, As an early intervention to increase student readiness to enter kindergarten, a
voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Program supplemented with enrichment hours and/or 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.) This program(s) is (are) supported by Department of Early Childhood Education
and/or Department of Exceptional Student Education) and follows all Florida statutes,
rules, and contractual mandates, including the use of a developmentally appropriate
curriculum that enhances the age-appropriate progress of children in attaining each of the
Florida Early Learning performance standards. Participating children are expected to
transition to kindergarten ready to learn and be successful in school and later life.

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

increase ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 by 13% from 36% to 49%
Will

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

Small group instruction will be monitored by the Principal and AP, as well as by the support
people in place e.g SSCC, LTF, Math Resource, SAI. Consistent meetings with teachers and tutors that
will be placed to assist with the model of small group instruction. Grove Park implements multiple
measures of analyzing school-wide data that drives the RTI process.
Student assessments include but are not limited to Star Early Literacy, Diagnostics, Performance Matters
Assessments, PM assessments, iReady district diagnostics, and varied Benchmark Assessments and the
ACCESS and FSAAA. Teachers are trained by instructional coaches to assess data, modify, and
implement DI
based on the results of data. Monitoring is an essential piece to achieving student success. A data dive
will take place every two weeks, to monitor student progress and adjust strategies and review student
progress, lesson plans, PD needs and adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Cousins (matthew.cousins@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.)

Use of high yielding strategy of small groups, This will guide student practice by asking questions and providing feedback. Small group instruction will also allow teachers to check that students understand text full curriculum alignment to standards (also, instruction, assessment, and resources)
- Whole (Explicit), Guided, Small Group Instruction (tailored to needs of each child) Being cognizant of students in the various subgroups and assuring accommodations and modifications are added with fidelity.
- Increased Rigor High Order Questions (Marzano Taxonomy, to utilization from retrieval)
Question Stems, Regular practice, high text complexity
Academic Language and Conversations, Vocabulary in Context (spiraled throughout the year in the modules)
Bi-weekly data dives will take place, where teachers will monitor short- and long-term
goals and discuss practice adjustments.
Teachers will utilize formative assessments to narrow in on specific skills for practice, assessment, and adjustment. Teachers will utilize Voyager and Benchmark curriculum with students who are less than 2 years behind. Field Trips (transferring and applying knowledge outside of the classroom) Stem Integration

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

Small group provides intensive instruction on specific skills on a daily basis
that promotes the development of the various components of reading proficiency to students who show minimal progress after reasonable time in tier 2 small group instruction (tier 3). Assuring Curriculum Alignment
When regularly exposed to standards-based instruction, assessment, and resources, students are better equipped to achieve proficiency and gains.
- Whole Group, Guided, Small Group Instruction
When instruction goes beyond teacher-explicit delivery to include small group, instruction is then tailored to the individual need of students, for a personal approach to learning.
- Increased Rigor
When students are exposed to high-yielding strategies through both explicit and small group instruction, students' capacity to apply critical thinking and problem-solving is increased.
- Expanded Student Schema and Background Knowledge
Students are better able to connect to text and concepts when knowledge of
vocabulary,

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

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

Based on our review of data, the highest percent of students performed on grade level in kindergarten in comparison to first and second grades. We have out lots of emphasis on building capacity of our primary students. Results of the i-Ready Reading AP3 assessment indicated that 78% of kindergarten students scored at Tier 1 (on or above grade level), 62% of first grade students scored at Tier 1 (on or above grade level), and only 50% of second grade students at Tier 1 (on are above grade level). Consequently, the highest percent of students performing below grade level was evidenced in second grade with 22% scoring at Tier 3 (two or more grade levels below).It is imperative for students to achieve grade level mastery so that students enter third grade Reading fluently and better prepared to comprehend and analyze text. Strengthening ELA instruction in K-2 classrooms will positively impact student performance and grade level readiness in subsequent grades.

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

To ensure effective and targeted instruction for success of all students in English Language Arts increasing reading on grade level by 3rd grade to 75, in grades PreK-5. When reviewing our school data, we see that our lowest subgroup performance is within ELA performance. ESSA identified students with disabilities as an area for Targeted Support & Intervention. Reading provides a direct correlation to performance in other content areas as well, including Science and Mathematics. While FY21 showed a 3% improvement in learning gains compared to FY21 as well as a improvement in L25 learning gains, we haven't made significant increases to math with proficiency according to the district or state average, there is a clear need for targeted interventions in grades K-5.
The iReady AP3 results continue to show a significant need in the areas of vocabulary and

phonics which parallels with the reading scores of students entering the next grade level.
We will have to We will provide the scaffolding necessary for students to access grade level content in order to make progress and move towards
proficiency.

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

If instructional practices related to ELA are improved in grades K-2, then 70% percent of students will score at Tier 1 (on or above grade level) on the 2023 i-Ready Reading AP3 assessment and will be on track to score a level 3 by third grade on the statewide standardized ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If instructional practices related to ELA are improved in grades 3-5, then 50% of students will meet high standards (Level 3 of higher) and 50% will demonstrate achievement on the 2023 statewide standardized ELA 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.

Administration along with the leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to monitor instructional delivery, lesson plans, student work samples, and the learning environment and provide feedback.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cousins, Matthew, matthew.cousins@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?

Techniques maximize student engagement through opportunities for students to interact with content during
explicit instruction. One key component of effective literacy instruction is Reading fluency. Maximizing opportunities for students to interact with text through guided and repeated readings will lead to strengthening of reading skills and improve learning outcomes. Writing is another fundamental skill that students need to develop. Making time for students to write daily will not only accelerate writing development, but will enhance skills in reading, vocabulary, and language

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?

Our school will implement the targeted element of Interactive Learning Environments and Teaching Techniques vetted by the district based on our findings that interactive learning environments support all learning styles providing students with a variety of scaffolds and opportunities to interact with content. Interactive teaching
environments and techniques promote active learning, maximize time for practice and application of skills,
and leads to improved learning outcomes.

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
1. Embed daily opportunities for students to focus on fluency and enhancing vocabulary with genuine thoughts and ideas both orally and in writing. As a result, students writing skills will improve. The date range for this action step is 8/11/2023 - 05/15/2024. 2. Plan for engaging activities that incorporate the writing process so that students can practice and develop essential writing skills. As a result, teachers will plan for activities that incorporate authentic student writing. The date range for this action step is 8/11/2023 - 05/15/2024. 3. Enhance daily fluency instruction through modeled read-a-louds, partner reading, choral reading, repeated reading, and independent reading. As a result, student comprehension will improve. The date range for this action step is 8/11/2023 - 05/15/2024. 4. Implement Tier 2 and 3 interventions with fidelity to strengthen the foundational literacy skills of students in the lowest 25th percentile. As a result, students will be able to decode text more easily and reading fluency will improve. The date range for this action step is 8/11/2023 - 05/15/2024.	McIntyre, Andrea, andrea.mcintyre@palmbeachschools.org

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

n/a

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

n/a

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No