Lighthouse Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lighthouse Elementary School

4750 DAKOTA DR, Jupiter, FL 33458

https://ltes.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.

Lighthouse Elementary 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 responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lighthouse Elementary School envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Montez, Nina	Principal	School Leader develops standardized curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff and oversees facilities.
Torres, David	Assistant Principal	Supports School Leader: Helps develop standardized curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, coordinates support for ESOL students and families, coordinates testing, orders and monitors textbooks, evaluates staff, and oversees facilities.
Frederick, Angela	Teacher, ESE	ESE Coordinator: Communicates with parents/teachers to support students with IEP/EPs. Collaborates with teachers to provide support for special education students, monitors student achievement and IEP goals/EP goals, discusses best practices with team members, and helps to identify students that need extra support.
Trivison, Tammy	Other	The School Leader: Communicates with parents/teachers to support students in the tiers with Response to Intervention specialized instruction. Collaborates with teachers to provide support for students that need extra reading intervention, monitors student achievement and RtI goals, discusses best practices with team members ,and helps to identify students that need extra support. Coordinates and keeps records of all progress of students in SBT and RtI. Coordinates meetings to monitor students with parents, teachers, and support staff.
Griffin, Nicole	School Counselor	PBS Coach and Character Education teacher. Assists SBT in developing behavior plans, School 504 contact, coordinates 504 meetings, communicates with parents/teachers/students re 504 plans. Supports migrant and homeless children, collaborates and coordinates student social/emotional

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		heath support, as well as referrals for parents to community resources in conjunction with school Behavioral Health Professional.
Kainec, Kathy	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher K-2: Implements IEPs with fidelity, collaborates with teachers, monitors student achievement, discusses best practices with team members, and supports teachers with implementing IEPs in the classroom.
Havener, Tara	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Teacher and Team Leader for Grade 1: Implements the school curriculum with fidelity, collaborates with team members and provides leadership, monitors student achievement, discusses best practices with team members, and identifies students that need extra support.
Klug, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Second Grade Teacher and Team Leader for 2nd Grade: Implements the school curriculum with fidelity, collaborates with team members and provides leadership, monitors student achievement, discusses best practices with team members, and identifies students that need extra support.
Lemoine, Cathy	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Grade Teacher and Team Leader for Kindergarten: Implements the school curriculum with fidelity, collaborates with team members and provides leadership, monitors student achievement, discusses best practices with team members, and identifies students that need extra support.

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.

In developing the School Improvement Plan, Lighthouse Elementary stakeholders meet regularly, and with frequency, to review data trends related to student academic performance, school climate and culture components, as well as early warning indicators that impact student success. With our improvement goals being that all students reach their highest potential in the core subject areas, with

highly qualified teachers, within a warm and nurturing environment, the input from instructional leadership, teachers and staff, parents, and the community are essential factors in decision making as it relates to funding and support that directly and positively impacts the SIP goals. These teams gather to share their insights, identify priorities,, and develop action steps at each of their meetings. The Instructional Leadership Team, Grade Level Chairpersons and Faculty meetings are all on separate monthly cycles and all address in-the-moment student performance, as well as positive behavior and climate agenda items. Our School Based Team meets near the end of each trimester, as well as on 6-8 week rotations for individual students as needed, to support the academic and behavioral needs of all students. Our Positive Behavior Support Committee meets monthly to build programming to teach and celebrate student PBS. Our School Advisory Meetings are held bimonthly to welcome parents and community members along with school administration, teachers and staff in these same efforts of examining trends and finding opportunities for growth. All of these teams and committees work to pinpoint areas of need, identify opportunities for improvement, and work together to share and collaborate for the purpose of bolstering student performance and participation.

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 performance data related to academics and behavior are examined carefully by administration, by teachers independently and through routinely scheduled grade level meetings, as well as through regularly scheduled intervention and enrichment support teams, in order to assure constant growth in our students. Instructional Leadership, Grade Level Leadership and School Based Team assure the academic support and ongoing success of our students, as well as the related professional development needs of our teachers and staff. Our Positive Behavior Support Committee, the service network assured by our Behavioral Health Professional and School Counselor, and our School Based Team, are all integral components that offer a support and safety to individuals, as well as schoolwide influences for programs that build a positive climate for learning. Our School Advisory Committee is informed of academic and social element of student life through bimonthly meetings, and offers a platform for input and additional support from parent and community stakeholders, with the same intent to assure overall student growth, as positive climate, and successful achievement.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	29%
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) 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.	
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	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	8	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	7	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	4	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	3	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	2	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) Updated (pre-populated)

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	4	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	3	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	80	53	53	86	59	56			
ELA Learning Gains				80					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64					
Math Achievement*	78	57	59	88	53	50			
Math Learning Gains				78					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74					
Science Achievement*	75	54	54	79	59	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	85	56	59	55			76		

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	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	604
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK				
HSP	70			
MUL	85			
PAC				

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%
WHT	79			
FRL	57			

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	64			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK				
HSP	72			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	74			

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	80			78			75					85
SWD	48			45			44				4	
ELL	71			63			50				4	85
AMI												
ASN	85			91							3	
BLK												
HSP	74			73			52				4	

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
MUL	93			78			85				3	
PAC												
WHT	80			78			78				4	
FRL	57			56			60				4	

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	86	80	64	88	78	74	79					55
SWD	58	67	55	66	75	74	52					
ELL	78	70	54	72	61	60	42					55
AMI												
ASN	88	89		94	89							
BLK												
HSP	86	81	67	79	64	44	82					
MUL	94	82		88	73							
PAC												
WHT	86	79	67	91	81	86	78					
FRL	78	78	63	81	75	74	71					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students												76
SWD												
ELL												76
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												

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
FRL												80

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.

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 iReady reading data from the final diagnostic assessment in 2023 identified two areas of weakness across all grade levels K-2, they were vocabulary and comprehension of informational text. KG-2 overall scored 12% and 14% as being one or more grade levels below, respectively in those areas.

The iReady reading data from the first (Fall) diagnostic assessment of the 2022-23 school year identified these same two common area of weakness across all grade levels K-2 which showed Vocabulary at 55% of students one or more years below grade level and comprehension of informational text showing 52% of students one or more years below grade level.
A minimal number of students scored overall one year or more below grade level by the end of SY23, with the breakdown as follows: KG- 4% (up from 64% in the fall), 1st- 12% (up from 61% in the fall), and 2nd- 9% (up from 42% in the fall).

Although remarkable schoolwide growth occurred over a period of one year, the areas where the most opportunity for improvement still remain: vocabulary and comprehension of informational text overall for grades K-2.

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

There were only slight declines in any ELA performance area, with the Phonological Awareness domain being the greatest slip from a 95% to a 93% in those scoring on or above grade level. This domain is still one of the overall highest scoring areas, both school years, but because it is the one area where we showed decline, we will focus on improvement across grade levels in that area.

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.

NA due to the fact that we are a K-2 only school site.

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

Based on progress monitoring, using iReady diagnostic data and comparing data from 2022 to 2023 to identify the domains supporting the reading process, there were two areas that continued to show no significant changes from one year to the next and would be considered strengths for our students: phonological awareness and high-frequency word knowledge. The overall placement for K-2 in phonological awareness on the final diagnostic in 2023 identified 93% of all students on grade level and 7% one level below grade level. In 2023, 94% of all K-2 students were on grade level when reading high frequency words and 6% were one level below grade level.

There was one additional area in literacy that demonstrated significant improvement from 2022 to 2023, which was Vocabulary, where students showed 44 points of growth from fall to spring, from 44% on grade level in the fall, to 88% on grade level by spring of 2022. Intentional and strategic planning is insisted upon in order to maintain achievement in these areas (phonological awareness, high frequency words and vocabulary) will support students as they build a foundation for the reading process.

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

Within our Early Warning Systems data we showed an improvement of our students with less than 90% Attendance for the school year, trending upward from 70 to only 50 students from SY22 to SY23. We hope to continue with that momentum by offering incentives and recognitions for students who are in school most every day, and who are on time for the start of each day. These are positive factors that are proven to increase student engagement and achievement.

In addition to addressing attendance, Lighthouse Elementary plans to increase student readiness for Kindergarten by increasing Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Programming supplemented with enrichment hours and a PreK self-contained program for students ages 3 to 5 determined eligible for exceptional student education based on goals and services as written on the Individual Education Plan. These programs are supported by the Department of Early Childhood Education and the Department of Exceptional Student Education and follow all Florida statutes, rules, and contractual mandates. This past year, we made PreKindergarten programming a top priority for Lighthouse Elementary by expanding from one VPK unit, to two VPK Inclusion units, and we also added an additional full day ESE PreK units, increasing to a total of two ESE PreK units. We are reaching more students by providing much needed preschool services for our surrounding area.

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

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

2. Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.
3. Our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts.
4. Our school will continue to build upon the Positive Behavior Support Systems that enhance the

climate within our school building.

5. Our school will continue to grow our PreKindergarten programming to support the growing need in our community for preschool options for general education and exceptional students also.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, we will increase the overall percentage of students at or above grade level of 91% in ELA by 4% bringing us up to 95%.
Additionally, we will lower the percentage of students that are one or two grade levels below on ELA (iReady) by 3% reducing our percentage from 8% from to 5%.
Students that are identified as Hispanic had a success rate of 85% meeting ELA proficiency at the end of the 2022-2023 school year, and Students with Disabilities had a success rate of 84% of students meeting ELA proficiency by year end.

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

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

Our goal is to increase the ELA performance of two selected subgroups by 5%, our SWD Students with Disabilities and our Hispanic students. With the overall performance goal of 95% in ELA iReady as an overall k-2 average, we will pinpoint our focus on increasing the percentage of students in the Hispanic and SWD subgroups by at least 5% in ELA proficiency, raising them to 90% and 89% respectively.

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

Progress will be monitored through Benchmark assessments, standards specific data point collection related to core instruction within the daily lesson, Unit assessments, iReady lessons, iReady diagnostics and State standardized testing (PM1, PM2 and PM3).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nina Montez (nina.montez@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.)

Daily small group reading instruction will need to take place to support all learners and differentiate instruction. Daily explicit phonics instruction will support students with reading and writing. Students that are below grade level will need to be provided extra reading support, including using Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) materials. Students who are struggling would be referred to School Based Team and additional interventions will be decided upon, implemented and tracked, based on each students specific deficiencies. Students would be monitored carefully for their progress.

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

Multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) offers an increasing levels of support as needed, based on the progress of the student once their individual needs are carefully identified.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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 carefully identify student performance in the focus ELA domain areas (Vocabulary and Informational Text), then create and implement high quality, standards-specific independent tasks and activities within the Reading Block, and in the Small Groups that are differentiated to meet the needs of individual students, we will then yield positive student outcomes on standards related assessments.

The iReady reading data from the final diagnostic assessment in 2023 identified two areas of weakness across all grade levels K-2, they were vocabulary and comprehension of informational text. KG-2 overall scored 12% and 14% as being one or more grade levels below, respectively in those areas.

The iReady reading data from the first (Fall) diagnostic assessment of the 2022-23 school year identified these same two common area of weakness across all grade levels K-2 which showed Vocabulary at 55% of students one or more years below grade level and comprehension of informational text showing 52% of students one or more years below grade level.
A minimal number of students scored overall one year or more below grade level by the end of SY23, with the breakdown as follows: KG- 4% (up from 64% in the fall), 1st- 12% (up from 61% in the fall), and 2nd- 9% (up from 42% in the fall).

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

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

Student performance in each of the ELA domain areas (Vocabulary and Informational Text) should show an increase, as students work to master the grade level standards in those areas. Our baseline performance will begin with the Fall iReady scores.
Increase of up to 95% in ELA performance. Currently, we are at 91%.

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

Progress monitoring will be done utilizing and approved tool that aligns with the target area of academic focus, and the intervention, on either a biweekly or weekly occurrence and documented on a Progress Monitoring Log.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Trivison (tammy.trivison@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.)

Provide small group differentiated instruction targeted to meet the instructional needs of students during Core (Tier 1) Instruction for all students. If underperforming student do not show improvement, supplemental small group targeted instruction for an additional 30 minutes outside of the reading block, followed by more intensive and explicit instruction utilizing programs such as SPIRE and Sounds Sensible.

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

Differentiation of instruction, as well as targeted intervention when needed utilizing researched-based interventions are proven methods of increasing student performance.

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

#3. 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.

Reducing the number of students who are absent from school will have a positive impact on individual student performance, and enhancing the positive school experience and mindset of students inherent concepts of school.

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

At the close of last school year, we improved the number of students with less than 90% attendance from 70 students in SY22, to 50 students in SY23. This school year, we intend to have no more than 30 students with less than 90% attendance, schoolwide.

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

Attendance data will be monitored by the attendance clerk who will assist in generating communications home once students have more than 5 unverified absences, and again in increments as suggested by Safe Schools guidelines. The district manual for Attendance/Truancy will guide processes to notify, intervene and support students who show significant absenteeism from school. Students who have been identified with chronic absences will be referred to School Based Team as needed, and engagement strategies, community resources and support, will be pursued to improve their connection to school. District Attendance Liaison utilized as needed.
Our school will work to acknowledge and celebrate the presence and commitment of students who show up to school most every single day. We will engage in school-wide events that wrap learning into fun, exploration and unique experiences, to peak the love of school. We will increase the number of extra curricular opportunities that are geared toward students' interests, talents and curiosities to bolster their interest in being a part of their school community We will communicate with families the realities of long term impacts when school days are missed and offer support as needed for healthy attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nina Montez (nina.montez@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.)

Research shows that a high quality family, school, and community partnership. We can achieve this through personally welcoming family involvement, especially in those students who seem disconnected to school, by building rapport and interpersonal relationships with individual students, their siblings (ie middle and high school volunteer on-campus opportunities) and their parents through volunteer committees, input into school functions and programs, and frequent communications related to attendance status.

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

Healthy student attendance is essential to 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

<div style="background-color:#e0c384;">

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.

</div>

No action steps were entered for this area of focus