**The School District of Palm Beach County** 

# **Del Prado 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                            | 8  |
|   |    |
| III. Planning for Improvement                               | 13 |
|   |    |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review                       | 0  |
|   |    |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0  |
|   |    |
| VI. Title I Requirements                                    | 0  |
|   |    |
| VII Budget to Support Areas of Focus                        | 0  |

## **Del Prado Elementary School**

7900 DEL PRADO CIR N, Boca Raton, FL 33433

https://dpes.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), <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">https://www.floridacims.org</a>, 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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**

### **Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| 2023-24 Status<br>(per MSID File)  | Active  |
|--|---|
| ü /  | Flormanton, Cabaal  |
| School Type and Grades Served  | Elementary School   |
| (per MSID File)  | KG-5  |
| Primary Service Type   | K-12 General Education  |
| (per MSID File)  | K-12 General Education  |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status  | No  |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate  | 45%   |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate  | 44%   |
| 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)  School Grades History | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)  2021-22: A 2019-20: A |
| *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2018-19: A<br>2017-18: A  |
| School Improvement Rating History  |   |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History  |   |
| , , ,  | ı   |

### **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   |    |    | Gı | rade | Lev | vel |   |   |   | Total |
|---|----|----|----|------|-----|-----|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator   | K  | 1  | 2  | 3    | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 20 | 21 | 21 | 24   | 17  | 36  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139   |
| One or more suspensions   | 1  | 0  | 3  | 3    | 4   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 12 | 33 | 25 | 22   | 34  | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152   |
| Course failure in Math  | 7  | 14 | 20 | 18   | 38  | 37  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134   |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9    | 17  | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8    | 18  | 20  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 3  | 5  | 7  | 18   | 29  | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88    |

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                            |   |    |    | Grad | e Lev | el |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|----|----|------|-------|----|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator                            | K | 1  | 2  | 3    | 4     | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 9 | 18 | 20 | 23   | 38    | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145   |

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

| Indicator                           |   |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|--|
| indicator                           | K | 1 | 2           | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 4 | 1 | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6     |  |  |  |  |
| 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   |    |    | Total |    |    |    |   |   |   |       |
|---|----|----|-------|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator   | K  | 1  | 2     | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 24 | 27 | 31    | 27 | 32 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171   |
| One or more suspensions   | 1  | 1  | 2     | 1  | 1  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 7  | 21 | 19    | 30 | 36 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148   |
| Course failure in Math  | 2  | 3  | 10    | 7  | 18 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0  | 0  | 0     | 22 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 12 | 13 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4  | 9  | 11    | 23 | 29 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |       |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| indicator                            | K           | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 4           | 9 | 11 | 23 | 29 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110   |  |  |

#### The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| indicator                           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 0 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 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   |    |    | Total |    |    |    |   |   |   |       |
|---|----|----|-------|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator   | K  | 1  | 2     | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 24 | 27 | 31    | 27 | 32 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171   |
| One or more suspensions   | 1  | 1  | 2     | 1  | 1  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 7  | 21 | 19    | 30 | 36 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148   |
| Course failure in Math  | 2  | 3  | 10    | 7  | 18 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0  | 0  | 0     | 22 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 12 | 13 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4  | 9  | 11    | 23 | 29 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110   |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |    | Grad | de Le | vel |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|----|------|-------|-----|---|---|---|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2  | 3    | 4     | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 4 | 9 | 11 | 23   | 29    | 34  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110   |

#### The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| indicator                           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 0 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 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 Company             |        | 2023     |       |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       |
|------------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| Accountability Component           | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*                   | 75     | 53       | 53    | 78     | 59       | 56    | 80     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains                 |        |          |       | 77     |          |       | 69     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile         |        |          |       | 63     |          |       | 76     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*                  | 77     | 57       | 59    | 80     | 53       | 50    | 79     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains                |        |          |       | 76     |          |       | 71     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile        |        |          |       | 67     |          |       | 56     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*               | 68     | 54       | 54    | 72     | 59       | 59    | 76     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*        |        |          |       |        | 66       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration         |        |          |       |        | 54       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                    |        |          |       |        | 47       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career<br>Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                       | 50     | 56       | 59    | 69     |          |       | 72     |          |       |

<sup>\*</sup> 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           |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 5   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index           |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)     | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 73  |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |    |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduation Rate                                |    |  |  |  |  |  |

## ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

|                  | 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWD              | 53                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL              | 56                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AMI              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN              | 93                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK              | 95                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP              | 69                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUL              | 79                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAC              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT              | 69                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL              | 67                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|                  | 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWD              | 63                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL              | 59                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AMI              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN              | 82                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK              | 67                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP              | 74                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup                   | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUL                                |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAC                                |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT                                | 71                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL                                | 71                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## **Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

|                 | 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2021-22 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2021-22 | ELP<br>Progress |  |
| All<br>Students | 75   |        |                | 77           |            |                    | 68          |         |              |                         |                           | 50              |  |
| SWD             | 52   |        |                | 56           |            |                    | 50          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 40              |  |
| ELL             | 54   |        |                | 69           |            |                    | 42          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 50              |  |
| AMI             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |
| ASN             | 95   |        |                | 91           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         | 2                         |                 |  |
| BLK             | 100  |        |                | 90           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         | 2                         |                 |  |
| HSP             | 71   |        |                | 72           |            |                    | 77          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 50              |  |
| MUL             | 69   |        |                | 88           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         | 2                         |                 |  |
| PAC             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |
| WHT             | 75   |        |                | 77           |            |                    | 61          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 48              |  |
| FRL             | 70   |        |                | 67           |            |                    | 64          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 57              |  |

|                 | 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 | ELP<br>Progress |  |  |
| All<br>Students | 78   | 77     | 63             | 80           | 76         | 67                 | 72          |         |              |                         |                           | 69              |  |  |
| SWD             | 60   | 82     | 73             | 47           | 62         | 64                 | 53          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| ELL             | 52   | 60     | 54             | 64           | 74         | 62                 | 38          |         |              |                         |                           | 69              |  |  |
| AMI             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| ASN             | 88   | 65     |                | 92           | 82         |                    | 82          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |

|           | 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |
|-----------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 | ELP<br>Progress |  |
| BLK       | 67   |        |                | 67           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |
| HSP       | 78   | 83     | 71             | 78           | 75         | 63                 | 72          |         |              |                         |                           | 70              |  |
| MUL       |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |
| PAC       |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |
| WHT       | 78   | 75     | 56             | 80           | 74         | 71                 | 70          |         |              |                         |                           | 64              |  |
| FRL       | 71   | 79     | 71             | 72           | 80         | 78                 | 60          |         |              |                         |                           | 59              |  |

|                 |             |        | 2020-2         | 1 ACCOU      | NTABILIT   | Y COMPO            | NENTS BY    | SUBGRO  | UPS          |                         |                           |                 |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 | ELP<br>Progress |
| All<br>Students | 80          | 69     | 76             | 79           | 71         | 56                 | 76          |         |              |                         |                           | 72              |
| SWD             | 51          | 55     |                | 47           | 42         |                    | 45          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ELL             | 65          | 82     |                | 67           | 67         |                    | 82          |         |              |                         |                           | 72              |
| AMI             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ASN             | 92          |        |                | 88           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| BLK             | 86          |        |                | 79           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| HSP             | 79          | 67     | 73             | 82           | 69         | 71                 | 72          |         |              |                         |                           | 74              |
| MUL             | 92          |        |                | 83           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| PAC             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| WHT             | 78          | 69     | 73             | 76           | 66         | 33                 | 73          |         |              |                         |                           | 64              |
| FRL             | 72          | 60     | 71             | 69           | 59         | 53                 | 60          |         |              |                         |                           | 81              |

### 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 70%    | 56%      | 14%                               | 54%   | 16%                            |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 73%    | 58%      | 15%                               | 58%   | 15%                            |

|       |               |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 78%    | 48%      | 30%                               | 50%   | 28%                            |

|       |               |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 97%    | 54%      | 43%                               | 54%   | 43%                            |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 36%      | *                                 | 48%   | *                              |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 83%    | 57%      | 26%                               | 59%   | 24%                            |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 64%    | 52%      | 12%                               | 61%   | 3%                             |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 71%    | 56%      | 15%                               | 55%   | 16%                            |

|       |               |        | SCIENCE  |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 64%    | 51%      | 13%                               | 51%   | 13%                            |

## III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Grade 4 Math with 64% proficiency. The previous year's proficiency was 79%. This is a 15% decrease in one year's time. Factors that contributed to this year's low performance included two teachers leaving mid year and being replaced by two teachers new to the profession. and grade level. In addition, 4th grade math class sizes were larger in number due to the number of students enrolled in 4th grade advance placement math (AMP). There were a number of gifted students who did not take 4th grade AMP, but instead joined in a 4th grade general education math class. Therefore, general education math course class sizes increased significantly. In addition, there were fewer teachers instructing 4th grade math compared to the previous school year, therefore increasing math class size for this school year.

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

The data component showed the greatest decline in 4th grade Math with a drop of 15% between 2022 and 2023. In 2022 Grade 4 Math proficiency was at 79%. In 2023 Grade 4 Math proficiency declined to 64%. Factors that contributed to this decline were large class sizes and transient educators.

## 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 data component which had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Grade 5 Science. Our scores were 13% higher than Palm Beach County's proficiency score of 51%. Teachers utilized hands-on Science investigations and activities. They also utilized the district's Blender lessons, STEM Scopes, and J&J Boot Camp resources. Teachers worked together to follow and plan targeted standards-based lessons to meet the needs of all students.

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

The data component which showed the most improvement was 3rd Grade math which increased in student proficiency from 76% in FY 22 to 78% in FY23.

The new actions that we took to increase student proficiency in 3rd grade math included focusing on targeted small group instruction during the math block. Teachers met daily with small groups of students and targeted specific skills based on student data from FSQ's, USA's, iReady diagnostics, and FAST PM data. During PLC, teachers analyzed recent assessment data and identified areas of focus. This allowed teachers to develop strategic lesson plans to meet the diverse needs of all students.

In addition, every teacher participated in individualized iReady professional development. During these sessions teachers worked with the iReady instructional specialist to analyze student performance and identify strengths and weaknesses. Teachers developed student grouping based on student performance levels on various math standards and strands. Teachers also worked on customizing student lesson paths to provide personalized instruction which provides students with lessons based on their individual skill level and needs. This allowed the students to learn at a pace that is just right for them.

Another strategy that we instituted to increase student proficiency in math was implementing math iii groups. During these sessions teachers worked individually or in small groups with students who were performing below grade level and focused on remediating specific skills based on student data and need.

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

Ensuring student success is at the forefront of our focus. If we address the areas of concern below, we are

ensuring our students receive the support needed for growth and achievement. When looking at our Early

Warning System indicators our two potential areas of concern are:

- 1. Levels 1 & 2 State Assessments 4th Grade Math
- 2. Levels 1 & 2 State Assessments 5th Grade Science

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

- 1. Small group instruction will provide strategically, differentiated instructional support for all ELA and Math.
- 2. Science instruction will utilize hands-on activities to reinforce science concepts and skills. Strategies that will be implemented include The 5E model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate) of science instruction.

- 3. Professional Learning Communities will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies. There will be a focus on analyzing data to inform small-group instruction and planning.
- 4. Continue double down model in all ELA/Math classrooms focusing on the needs of our ESSA identified subgroups.
- 5. ELA Achievement Growth for ESOL students. To ensure learning gains and progress for our ESOL students we will analyze student data. Students who fall within this subgroup will specifically be monitored for progress and receive additional support from teachers, ensuring lessons are planned based on the specific needs of the students.

#### **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 Science**

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

If we focus on standards-based instruction to increase proficiency in 5th-grade science, then we will increase student achievement and ensure alignment to the District's Strategic Plan; This area of focus aligns directly with our District Strategic Plan, Theme A-Goal 3, Academic Excellence & growth. Our first instructional priority is to deliver, content, concept, or skill that is aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

The results of our FSA FY23 Science data for grade 5 reflects that it is one of our lowest-performing categories when comparing the scores from one year to the next. Our 5th grade science proficiency declined by from FY22(69%) to FY23 (64%).

Data indicates, that during science instruction and investigations with support from ESE and ELL teachers, we need to monitor what is being taught, and how it's being taught and make decisions to make the changes necessary to support all learners.

#### **Measurable Outcome:**

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

By February 2024, we will increase the overall percentage of students proficient on the Science Diagnostic by 5%, from 60% (FY 23) to 65% (FY 24).

By May 2024, we will increase the overall percentage of students proficient on the Science Statewide Assessment by 6%, from 64% (FY 23) to 70%.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

At Del Prado our monitoring techniques include:

Data Analysis

Data Chats with teachers/parents/students

Classroom Walks

Strategic standards based PLC planning

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurie Riopelle (laurie.riopelle@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. Incorporate hands-on standards-based investigations.
- 2. Science tutoring program to ensure learning supplemented with additional resources and teacher support.
- 3. Professional Learning Community (PLC) will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies utilizing student data to drive instruction.
- 4. Focus on fair game science standards during Fine Arts Media instructional rotations throughout the school year.
- 5. Utilize targeted instructional resources, including district-provided lesson plans and J&J Bootcamp materials.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- 1. Hands-on standards-based science investigations provide students with the opportunity to engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate critical science standards.
- 2. Students who participate in the science tutoring program have demonstrated an increase in student achievement based on the most recent data from standardized assessments.
- 3. PLC's allow teachers and leadership an opportunity to collaborate, to analyze data, and to make decisions to improve student achievement and progress. Utilizing USA and FSQ data helps us to meet the students' needs for standards-based practice and to identify areas of weakness for targeted remediation. Both USAs and FSQs have proven successful in preparing students for the FSA.
- 4. Fair game standards are previously taught standards from prior grades that require strategic review to ensure student success.
- 5. Both District-provided lesson plans and J&J Boot camp instructional materials have aided in significantly increasing student achievement when the programs are used with fidelity.

#### 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. Tutorials:
- a. Analyze student data to determine students for tutorial groups and the support necessary.
- b. Choose research-based supplemental materials and resources to during tutorials.
- c. Provide tutors with training to understand expectations and become familiar with materials to execute tutorials.

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** Tutorials will begin in January 2024. Participants will be chosen based on data, grouped based on need and separated by content. Tutorials will continue through May of 2024.

- 2. PLCs
- a. Assign PLC grade level facilitator
- b. Biweekly PLCs allow teams to plan with fidelity.
- c. Each grade level has a PLC Agreement that each teacher adheres to so that PLCs are effective and focused on productive planning.
- d. PLC Agendas are provided to each grade level to help guide the discussion and create a cohesive planning environment.
- e. During PLC, student data from FSQs and USAs will be analyzed to determine students' areas of growth and inform instruction.

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** PLCs will begin within the first month of the start of the 2024. PLCs will focus on student achievement, data analysis, and best practices. PLC's continue throughout the school year.

- 3. An instructional focus on Fairgame Standards during Fine Arts Media Course.
- a. During Media, instructor will used district provided lesson plans to reinforce fair-game standards during 5th grade Media classes.
- b. Media specialist will plan with 5th-grade science teachers to ensure that her lesson plans are strategically presented to students based on needs determined by student data.

**Person Responsible:** Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** The media specialist will begin implementing these lessons by the first week of October.

Teachers will utilize district-provided lesson plans and J&J Bootcamp instructional materials to provide hands standards-based science investigations.

- a. All 5th-grade science teachers will be provided with research-based instructional materials.
- b. Teachers will utilize 5E Science Model of instruction to plan standards-based science lessons.
- c. Teachers will analyze student data to guide science instruction.

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** All science instructional materials were provided to teachers within the first week of school. Hands-on investigations will take place twice per month in every 5th grade science classroom.

#### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

If we focus on standards-based instruction to increase proficiency in 4th grade math, then we will increase student achievement and ensure alignment to the District's Strategic Plan; This area of focus aligns directly with our District Strategic Plan, Theme A-Goal 3, Academic Excellence & growth. Our first instructional priority is to deliver, content, concept, or skill that is aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

The results of our FAST PM 3 data for grade 4 math show that it is our lowest performing category when comparing the scores from one year to the next. Our 4th grade math proficiency declined by 15 % from FY22(79%) to FY23 (64%).

Data indicates, during targeted small group, supplemental instruction, ELL, and ESE groups, we need to monitor what is being taught, and how it's being taught and make decisions to make the changes necessary to support all learners.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

By February 2024, we will increase the overall percentage of students in Math Progress Monitoring from 14% (PM1 FY22) to 42% and increase to 70% by May.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

At Del Prado our monitoring techniques include:

Classroom walks utilizing District provided "Look Fors" during the math block and specifically during small group.

Visual confirmation of adherence to the schedule.

Data analysis

Data chats with students, parents, and teachers

Student work samples

Monitoring supported by members of the Leadership Team.

PLC Facilitators at each grade level (or by subject for departmentalized grades)

Strategic planning for small group instruction during grade level PLCs

Meetings with and support for PLC Facilitators through monthly meetings with administrators

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurie Riopelle (laurie.riopelle@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. Incorporate Small group instruction to support students learning at their ability with a variety of tasks, process, and product.
- 2. FAST PM tutoring programs to ensure learning supplemented with additional resources and teacher support.
- 3. Math teachers will incorporate the use of technology-based programs including iReady.

4. 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.

- 1. Incorporate small group instruction utilizing USA and FSQ data to meet the students' needs for standards-based practice and to identify areas of weakness for target remediation.
- 2. PLCs and PDs allow teachers and leadership an opportunity to collaborate, analyze data, and make decisions to improve student achievement.
- 3. Panther Pal Program for students who are in need of extra guidance and support through weekly mentoring sessions spent with their Pal.
- 4. Students who participate in the FAST tutoring program have demonstrated an increase in student achievement based on the most recent data from standardized assessments.

#### 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. Incorporate Small Group Instruction
- a. Students will be assessed using USAs and FSQs in math. Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction strategies and small group instruction during the math block.
- b. Teachers will analyze student data to determine strengths and weaknesses in content area.
- c. Teachers will create all small group rotation cycles to ensure all students are supported.
- d. Monitoring will occur through the review of lesson plans and conducting teacher data chats.

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** Small group instruction will begin within the first two weeks of school and will be ongoing. Teachers will review data from FY23 and conduct formative assessments.

- 2. Tutorials
- a. Analyze student data to determine students for tutorial groups and the necessary level of support.
- b. Choose research-based supplemental materials and resources for instruction.
- c. Provide tutors guidance to understand expectations and become familiar with materials to execute materials.

Person Responsible: Laurie Riopelle (laurie.riopelle@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** Tutorials will begin January 2024. Student participants will be chosen based on data, grouped based on need and separated by content. Tutorials continue through May of 2024.

- 3. PLCs and PD
- a. Assign PLC grade level facilitator.
- b. Bi-weekly PLCs allow teams to plan with fidelity.
- c. Each grade level has a PLC agreement that each teacher adheres to so that PLCs are effective and focused on productive planning.

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** PLCs and PD will begin within the first month of 2024. PDs are based on data and observations of classroom walks. Coaches will support teachers with tiered PD.

- 4. Panther Pal Mentorship Program
- a. Strategically pairing Mentors with Mentees based on academic and personal needs.
- b. Participate in goal setting activities and monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Janet Quinlan (janet.quinlan@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** The Mentorship Program will begin at the beginning of the second trimester in November. Mentors are school staff members who will meet with students twice a month.

#### **#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

If we focus on small-group ELA instruction with our ELL subgroup our ELL student achievement will increase. Our ESSA-identified subgroup ELLs have underperformed compared to our non-ELL students in 3rd grade ELA. Our ELL students were 57% proficient on the FAST PM 3, compared to our non-ELL students who were 82% proficient. Our overall 3rd-grade proficiency rate was at 77%. Data indicates, that during targeted small group, supplemental, ESE, ELL, and SAI groups, we need to monitor what is being taught, how it's being taught and make decisions to make the changes necessary to support all learners.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

In accordance with the Strategic Plan, we want to increase our ELL ELA proficiency from 35% to 50% by February and increase our ELL ELA proficiency to 65% in May as measured by the FAST PM Assessment. In addition, we want to increase our 3rd-grade ELA proficiency from 64% to 69% by February and from 77% to 82% proficiency in May.

#### **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. Careful monitoring provides administrators and teachers the information that they need to make decisions about instruction and support.

At Del Prado our monitoring techniques include:

Data Analysis

Data Chats with teachers/parents/students

Classroom Walks

Strategic Small Group PLC Planning

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurie Riopelle (laurie.riopelle@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. ELL students will participate in ELA small group instruction with their homeroom teacher as well as receive push-in support from an ELL Teacher.
- 2. ELL teachers will teach ELL students how to effectively use Heritage Language Dictionaries/Content Glossaries.
- 3. ELL teachers will use research-based interventions such as Rise/Rise Up, Sound Sensible, and Fountas and Pinnell Reading Intervention kit for ELL students in need of supplemental and or intensive reading support.
- 4. FAST ELA Tutoring programs to ensure learning supplemented with additional resources and teacher support.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- 1. Incorporate small group instruction utilizing Access, USAs, and FSQ data to meet the student's needs for standards-based practice and to identify areas of weakness for target remediation. Both USA's and FSQ's have proven successful in preparing students for FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment.
- 2. Heritage Language Dictionaries/Content Glossaries provide students with access to the academic

vocabulary in their native language to reduce the language barrier that prevents students from understanding grade-level content.

- 3. By securing specific training in Rise and Rise Up, Sound Sensible, Fountas & Pinnell Reading Intervention kit. ESOL teachers will have the skills and materials they need to focus on the academic needs of their ELL student
- 4. Students who participate in the FAST ELA tutoring program have demonstrated an increase in student achievement based on the most recent data from standardized assessments.

#### **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?

Nο

#### **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. Incorporate small group instruction:
- a. Students will be assessed using Access, USA's, and FSQ's in Language Arts. Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction strategies and small group instruction during ELA block.
- b. Teachers will analyze student data to determine strengths and weaknesses in content area.
- c. Teachers will create all small group rotation cycles to ensure all students are supported.
- d. Monitoring will occur through the review of lesson plans and conducting teacher data chats.

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** Small group instruction will begin within the first two weeks of school. Teachers will review data from FY 23 and conduct formative assessments to ensure proper placement of students within groups. Small group participation is fluid and flexible and will be updated continuously from data analysis. Small groups will continue throughout the year.

- 2. Heritage Language Dictionaries/Content Glossaries
- a. Distribute all dictionaries and glossaries to all ELL Students.
- b. Teach students how to use their dictionary and or glossary.
- c. Monitor usage of dictionaries and glossaries.

Person Responsible: Margaret Mueller (margaret.mueller@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** Heritage Language Dictionaries/ Content Glossaries were distributed within the first two weeks of school. Instruction on how to effectively use these resources will be ongoing throughout the school year.

- 3. Rise and Rise Up, Sound Sensible, Fountas & Pinnell Reading Intervention
- a. Identify students in need of Rise and Rise Up, Sound Sensible, Fountas & Pinnell Reading Intervention
- b. Organize all instructional materials.
- c. Prep all materials for each learning station.
- d. Attend all Rise and Rise Up trainings/Coaching sessions.

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** These resource materials will be utilized with students in small groups by the last week of September.

- 4. Tutorials
- a. Analyze student data to determine students for tutorial groups and the support necessary.
- b. Choose research-based supplemental materials and resources to during tutorials.

c. Provide tutors with training to understand expectations and become familiar with materials to execute tutorials.

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** Tutorials will begin in January 2024. Participants will be chosen based on data. They will be grouped based on need and separated by content. Tutorials continue through May of 2024.

#### #4. 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.

Based on discipline data from FY 23, physical aggression was the level 2 incident that received the most office discipline referrals. We had a total of 19 discipline reports for this behavior during the FY 23 school year. Although, data shows that this is a decline from FY 22 with 35 office discipline referrals. Physical aggression remains to be the most frequently occurring level 2 offense based on the school district's code of conduct.

#### **Measurable Outcome:**

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

#### Student Outcomes:

Reducing the amount of discipline referrals in the area of physical aggression by 10% by December 2023 and by another 10% by the end of the year.

Teacher practice outcomes:

By December 2023, 80% of our teachers will positively reinforce student behaviors.

By February 2024, 100% of our teachers will positively reinforce student behaviors.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

Classroom observation

Scheduled pulling of Suspension data

Scheduled pulling of Discipline Referral data

We will review and monitor student discipline data at our monthly faculty meetings.

Data will be collected on the distribution of PAWS coupons by each teacher.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@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. Panther Pal Mentorship Program
- 2. CHAMPS
- 3. SWPBS
- 4. 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. CHAMPS: is a classroom management program that aims to improve student behavior plus strengthen learner engagement through a strategic system of clearly defined expectations
- 2. SWPBS: supports the decrease of levels of disruptiveness, rates of office referrals, and suspensions. To improve school climate, safety, and order. To increase instructional time.
- 3. Panther Pal Mentorship Program: Strategically pairing Mentors with Mentees based on academic and social/emotional needs. Encourage meaningful relationships. Mentors and Mentees participate in goal-

setting activities and monitor progress.

4. 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.

- 1.Classroom-based interventions
- a. Teachers will utilize Classroom Based Early Stage Interventions to promote positive student behavior.
- b. Teachers will utilize the Corrective Behavior Intervention Record and the Classroom Management Tracking Form to document interventions being used to promote positive behavior and as a communication tool with parents.
- c. PD on Majors and Minors, as well as, Classroom Based Interventions will be provided on an ongoing basis to support teacher fidelity and provide them with the resources needed to promote positive behavior.

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** By the second week of school teachers will be provided with the intervention documents and resources needed to promote positive behavior. PD was provided during pre-school week.

SwPBS Action Steps:

- a. Cafeteria assemblies are conducted to review expectations
- b. Teachers reinforce expected behaviors in and out of the class through positive rewards
- c. Panther PAWS student incentives

**Person Responsible:** Janet Quinlan (janet.quinlan@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** By the second week of school, students will participate in school-wide assemblies and the Panther PAWS incentive program will be implemented.

#7. Policy 2.09 and Required Instruction Florida State Statute 1003.42 (Must ADD this verbiage) 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 & Dacific Islanders
- (o) Health Education, Life Skills & Docial Media
- (q) Hispanic Contributions
- (r) Women's Contributions
- (t) Civic & Daracter Education
- (u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

Person Responsible: Natasha Reid (natasha.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: This statue will be addressed on an ongoing basis through out the school year.