Boca Raton Community Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Boca Raton Community Middle School

1251 NW 8TH ST, Boca Raton, FL 33486

https://brms.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.

Boca Raton Community Middle School 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 postsecondary education, responsible citizenship, productive careers, and success in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Boca Raton Community Middle School envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and graduate high school prepared for postsecondary education, productive careers, and success in a global society.

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
Greene, Emily	Assistant Principal	As a part of the leadership team and in the chain of command for the principal, the assistant principal position is the next tier of leadership and communication for systems, culture, and instruction. Responsible for the successful operation and academic/behavioral success of the teachers/ students within 8th grade as well as other duties such as master scheduling, new teachers, FLVS, and threat assessment.
Lee, Lisa	Principal	As the Instructional Leader of the School, Directing and Managing Culture, Systems and Instruction, the Principal ensures the State Statues, District Policies, and Mission and Vision of the District and School in order to ensure student success. The principal directly supervises all staff and is the top communicator to all stakeholders, staff capacity builder, and monitor of systems including: School Safety, Health and Facility School Wide Positive Behavior Support and Discipline Code of Conduct Teacher Evaluations/ Observations Progress monitoring of instruction in core areas (M,S,SS,LA) and elective coursework Ensure equity in accelerated coursework Ensure choice program success and growth in industry certification MTSS and students in need of intervention Staff Development and Teacher Capacity Parent and Community Involvement (SAC/PTA)
Hodgens, Jude	Assistant Principal	As a part of the leadership team and in the chain of command for the principal, the assistant principal position is the next tier of leadership and communication for systems, culture, and instruction. Responsible for the successful operation and academic/behavioral success of the teachers/ students within 7th grade as well as other duties such as safety, transportation, health screenings, wellness, and threat assessment.
Pribell, Joyce	Assistant Principal	As a part of the leadership team and in the chain of command for the principal, the assistant principal position is the next tier of leadership and communication for systems, culture, and instruction. Responsible for the successful operation and academic/behavioral success of the teachers/ students within 6th grade as well as other duties such as Cambridge, PTA/ SAC, pictures, SIP, and threat assessment reporting.
Renteria, Mayra	ELL Compliance Specialist	As a part of the leadership team our coordinator positions are the next tier of leadership and communication for systems, culture, and instruction having to do with our students learning English in our sheltered and collaborative programs, use of our community language facilitator, identifying and testing students, federal and state compliance and reporting, and parent communication.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team analyzes all of the data from the FAST previous year's test, other past trends, EWS, and gives input on goals for the year and determine biggest gains and areas of improvement.. A discussion that includes the effect of new staff on board for FY23-24 is done in order to to determine biggest areas of need and professional development for new teachers. Data is shared with team leaders and teachers at faculty meeting as well as our School Advisory Council meeting to gather input of the key areas they see as our improvement and strengths.

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))

Student assessments include the new Progress Monitoring which occur 3 times per year. We utilize FAST Reading and Math. Performance Matters Assessments, Florida Standards Assessments, Reading Plus, 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 instructional coaches to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction based on the results of data. Single school culture (Academics, Behavior, Climate) Academics: Collaborative Planning Communities and Professional Learning Communities occur every week per grade level. Grade level teachers meet with the academic coaches and administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and create
standards-based learning goal scales. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed.

Monitoring will take place throughout the year. We will monitor mastery of grade level benchmarks through the use of Unit Assessments, Reading Plus, and FAST Progress Monitoring. The Unit Assessments will occur every 4 weeks. Employing frequent monitoring will allow us to make adjustments to the instructional focus for remediation, remediating deficiencies before they become substantial. In addition, we will be able individualize instruction to best meet the needs of our students, thus increasing student achievement.
We strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:
• Review of Lesson Plans,
• Data Analysis,
• Classroom walks,
• Student attendance,
• Data Chats,
• Formal Observations,
• Professional Learning Communities attendance/participation,
• Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	66%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	83	96	249
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	87	78	225
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	9	5	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	38	56	139
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	114	109	342
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	85	56	225
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	25	20	75

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	0	0	0	0	0	117	116	115	348

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	6	2	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	5

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	0	0	0	0	0	91	62	87	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	46	64	123
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	70	82	206
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	57	64	202
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	70	82	206

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	0	0	0	0	0	99	64	83	246

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	1	1	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5

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	0	0	0	0	0	91	62	87	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	46	64	123
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	70	82	206
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	57	64	202
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	70	82	206

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	0	0	0	0	0	99	64	83	246

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	1	1	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5

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*	57	51	49	64	53	50	62		
ELA Learning Gains				56			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			35		
Math Achievement*	68	59	56	67	35	36	60		
Math Learning Gains				69			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			23		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	60	50	49	62	56	53	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	68	68	79	64	58	78		
Middle School Acceleration	78	76	73	90	52	49	79		
Graduation Rate					50	49			
College and Career Acceleration					70	70			
ELP Progress	59	37	40	56	85	76	55		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	636
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	49			
HSP	62			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	56			

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	56			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	47			
HSP	63			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	57			

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	57			68			60	74	78			59
SWD	23			37			28	53	60		6	15
ELL	35			51			30	58	55		6	59
AMI												
ASN	67			86			71	89	93		5	
BLK	40			47			32	46	80		5	
HSP	51			62			59	74	70		6	56
MUL	67			78			57	83	92		5	
PAC												
WHT	65			77			64	82	79		6	68
FRL	44			56			49	62	66		6	58

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	64	56	39	67	69	54	62	79	90			56
SWD	30	41	32	33	45	35	30	52	80			27
ELL	48	51	41	55	64	54	39	59	89			56
AMI												
ASN	76	83		84	87		71	91	100			
BLK	38	40	31	34	50	44	32	64	87			
HSP	61	56	45	63	68	63	57	74	87			59
MUL	68	55		76	77		72	71	83			
PAC												
WHT	72	56	38	76	73	47	71	84	91			57
FRL	54	50	39	56	64	53	52	67	90			47

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	62	53	35	60	41	23	57	78	79			55
SWD	24	30	23	22	22	17	22	58	56			47
ELL	44	47	37	43	34	23	29	70	70			55

| 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	42	33		36	27							
ASN	81	76		81	56		63	83	74			
BLK	39	41	21	30	24	14	33	55	81			36
HSP	60	50	37	54	39	24	56	78	79			55
MUL	59	46	50	64	36		53	73	65			
PAC												
WHT	69	58	41	70	47	30	65	85	80			59
FRL	52	47	31	47	34	22	45	73	70			51

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
07	2023 - Spring	49%	48%	1%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	47%	7%	47%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	45%	3%	47%	1%

| MATH | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	54%	54%	0%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	36%	2%	48%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	79%	65%	14%	55%	24%

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	55%	46%	9%	44%	11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	48%	51%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	50%	50%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	65%	5%	66%	4%

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.

Overall across all grade levels our achievement/proficient levels increased from 2% to 7 % in Language Arts, Social Studies, Science and Mathematics. In each category, there was improvement at Boca Middle this year. Noting the most improvement was 8th grade math in the achievement and learning gains categories making more than 12% point gain in proficiency, 24% points in gains and 20% points in low 25% in Math
By Grade level 6th grade is trending the lowest with 63% ELA, 68% in Mathematics. As a trend, 6th Grade for the last 2 years has not improved as much as their cohort in 7th by over 6%, and in mathematics trended lower by 7%.
In our subgroups we increased proficiency in ELA in 6 subgroups (SWD, ELL, MUL, WHT, & FRL). In Mathematics we increased in 8 subgroups (SWD, ELL, ASI, BLK, HIS, MUL, WHT, FRL).
As a trend ELA learning gains showed a slight increase, while mathematics showed a larger gain.

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

Data shows 6th grade ELA dropped the most at 63%. For subgroups, Black achievement in ELA dropped 1 % and is lowest in the category. We also saw a 3% drop in White proficiency. Additionally, there was a 6% drop in proficiency amount our MUL students in Social Students, and a 1% drop in WHT Math proficiency.

For students with warning systems, our numbers went up from 86 to 131 with two warning indicators, which we believe that post Covid background skills contributed to students getting F's in the quarter as well as Level 1s on the state wide test.

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 largest gap with the state was ELA which dropped for us 11 points but was also lower than the state average by 5 points.

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

The factors that contributed to the improvements are as follows:
1. We Incorporated engagement and monitoring strategies in small and large group such as: board config, whiteboards, exit tickets, response cards, interactive notebooks, and turn and talks focused around the standard.
2. We utilized Small group instruction to support students learning at their ability with a variety of tasks, process, and product.
3. We Incorporate the use of technology-based programs including Math Nation and IXL for both reading and math to integrate knowledge.
4. We had weekly Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development ensured teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies as well as analyze current data and change instruction to ensure those who are not proficient
5. We created FSA tutoring programs to ensure learning supplemented with additional resources and teacher support.
6. Our Administrators conducted teacher/admin Data Chats and teacher to student Data Chats quarterly to monitor proficiency and lowest 25% performance.
7. We Increased admin walkthroughs (non-evaluatively) to ensure PLC steps were implemented, and post -walkthrough debriefs to discuss the points next steps or recommendations.

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

Two particular areas of concern are students who have failed reading and or math (by quarter grades) and students who have more than 2 indicators of warning systems (total of 348 students).

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

In an effort to accelerate learning the following actions are needed in order to address this need for improvement will address the following:
1. In order to reduce failures, all math and ELA teachers will be trained on the new best standards and instructional strategies to help struggling learners.
2. Admin participation in weekly PLCs to ensure scope and sequence is followed, and looking at weekly grades, identifying students with potential failures and solutions to help.
3. Provide professional development and modeling through classroom observations in the effective use of the rotational model of instruction.
4. Have guidance counselors create a list of students in danger of failing and contact teachers and parents mid quarter to see how we can help.
5. Identify and specifically target students in the low 25%. Use progress monitoring of FSQs and USAs to identify the specific benchmarks that are weakest and create plans to remediate the lowest 25% of students in these areas.

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

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

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

We chose Early Warning Systems and students who are danger of failing and students who have two or more indicators because these students are critically important to being college and career ready, have a positive outlook on learning and growing, and not be retained in middle school. These students are also who are in our lowest 25% of students in ELA and MATH as well as some of the students are level 1 on the prior FSA as well.

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

By January 12, 2023, the number of students who failed Q1 and Q2 will be reduced by 20%. In ELA from 69 to 57 and in MATH from 139 to 115.

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

Students who are in danger of failing will be strategically focused on and discussed during weekly PLCs including the help of Admin, guidance, and parents. Monthly, students who are failing will be placed on a spreadsheet, teacher will contact parent, guidance will follow up with mental health strategeis if needed, and a plan in place for improvement for the strategy will be implemented. Monthly spreadsheets will be updated by Admin and guidance and shared with teachers. PLCs will be monitored by Admin weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Lee (lisa.lee@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.)

Professional learning communities is an evidence-based strategy where teachers come together to analyze and collect evidence from common assessments and using data protocols to determine which strategies were most effective or not/effective in order to make changes for the next instruction.

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

Specifying and being strategic about our most struggling learners and talking during PLCs about the ways in which we can help them succeed with admin, guidance, teachers, and parents involved is a way for all stakeholders to play a part in student success.

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.

In addition, as stipulated within Florida Statute & Policy 2.09 and in alignment to the District's Strategic plan our school ensures all students receive equal access to the pillars of Effective Instruction: Students

immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida
State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42.
Continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to
S.B. 2.09 Instruction 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

Person Responsible: Emily Greene (emily.greene@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: May 13, 2023

Strategic and Planned Professional Development/Professional Learning Communities:
a. Teachers will attend PD that shows the vision and mission of our SWPBS model for the school and
strategies on classroom behavior plans
b. Instructional staff engage in 15 hrs of PD outside the regular school day to focus on engaging
instructional strategeis
c. PD/PLCs will focus on students in danger of failing, and processes for them to achieve
d. Teachers will work collaboratively in PLCs to plan and develop lessons aligned to the standards.
e. PD will focus on instructional needs and building expertise for using online learning platforms such as
studysync and dreamworks/IXL, brainpop science, and 3D computer lab

Person Responsible: Lisa Lee (lisa.lee@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: March 30, 2023

#2. 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.

Teachers will teach the BEST standards content to students using adopted materials and high engagement including incorporating key instructional shifts articulated by the standards. Our FY23 FAST PM3 data shows our ELA proficiency at 51% proficient. Our prior FY22 FSA data shows that 61% of students were proficient. This proves that with the new BEST standards students need more support engaging with the rigor of the state
assessment and standards. By focusing on standards based instruction of the BEST standards we believe that we will be strategic and deliver standard-based instruction to ensure best practices utilized throughout all content areas. (Priority#1) We want to give all our students the opportunity to reach their potential and increase student achievement.

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

By May 30, 2023 62% of students will be proficient (Lv 3 or higher) as measured on the FAST ELA PM3 this will be 20% increase from the previous year.

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

Monitoring is a very important step towards student achievement and school improvement. It provides teachers and administration the data that they need to make decisions about instruction and differentiated support for the students. Monitoring will occur as a cycle that starts with Leadership Team Meetings, work through each ELA PLC meeting, and then move to Data Checkpoints reviewing FAST and FSQ/USA data and growth. During Data monitoring chats, we also review of Lesson Plans, Data Analysis, Classroom walks, Student work samples/portfolio/binder reviews, Student attendance, Data Chats, Formal Observations, Professional
Learning Communities attendance/participation, all Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology. Assistant Principals will report to the principal any instructional changes needed in order for the team to grow.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Lisa Lee (lisa.lee@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. Small group pairing and small group work: Teachers and well as supplemental support teachers will provide strategically, differentiated instructional support for all learnings.
2. Professional Development: Teachers and support staff will attend ongoing professional development to engage deep, focused, collaborative planning to support and strengthen data analysis and small group planning and implementation.
3. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies. PD will support the development of teacher expertise and instructional strategy success and focus.

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

Teacher collaboration is one of the only ways to roll out strategies so that consistency is seen throughout the entire grade level. From the principal, to APs, to team leaders, need professional development trends

will be gathered, such as "small group work" and be listed as a priority to roll out for professional development. Teachers who have a voice, and work together are proven to execute the strategy more so than those who work apart.

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