

The School District of Palm Beach County

Sandpiper Shores 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	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
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

Sandpiper Shores Elementary School

11201 GLADES RD, Boca Raton, FL 33498

<https://sses.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.

Sandpiper Shores Elementary 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.

Sandpiper Shores Elementary envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural 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
Coyle, Monique	Principal	<p>Responsibilities for SIP implementation/monitoring: Leadership, Observation/Feedback Cycles, monitor performance, goal setting with teachers/staff and students, parent communication, student progress monitoring in ELA and Math, schoolwide incentives</p> <p>School Leader Responsibilities: Mrs. Coyle supervises all aspects of the educational programming at Sandpiper Shores. As the instructional leader she is responsible for the equitable instruction of all students. She is the decision maker with regards to the master schedule, teacher evaluation and supervision, curriculum, hiring new teachers, school improvement, and all budgetary items and contracts. Additional activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Assistant Principal supervision -Leadership Team supervision -Monitoring School Data and meeting with teacher teams -School Advisory Council -Supporting Professional Learning Communities and PD trainings -School Safety -Community Partnerships -Deliberate Practice for all instructional Staff -Monitoring the deliberate implementation of our PBS system
Boone, Sheila	Assistant Principal	<p>Responsibilities for SIP implementation/monitoring: Leadership, Observation/Feedback Cycles, Monitor PLCs, Monitor data and performance, Set goals, Monitor student progress in ELA and Math, parent communication, teacher communication</p> <p>School Leader Responsibilities: Mrs. Boone works along side of Mrs. Coyle to support the principal in all aspects of school administration. In addition to supporting Mrs. Coyle's work, Mrs. Boone has the following job assignments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Manage Custodial Staff -School Safety -Supervision Schedules and Monitoring -Testing Coordinator -Support teachers using the Marzano Framework -Support teachers in their Professional Growth element -Educator Support Program -Create equitable schedules -Discipline Coordinator -Hiring, monitoring, and evaluating noninstructional staff
Bickler, Beth	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<p>Ms. Bickler is responsible for organizing and running PLC meetings for all grade levels which includes data analysis and planning the curriculum, small group instruction and iii groups. She participates in our MTSS meetings and works closely with the MTSS leader to analyze student data and determining</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the proper intervention for the student. She conducts Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups.
Rice, Traci	Other	Mrs. Rice is our SAI teacher. She teaches Tier 2 and tier 3 groups each day, She also runs our school based team (MTSS). She does professional development for the staff on the RTI process. She works closely with the principal to identify students who are below grade level. She analyzes the data is runs a very efficient meeting weekly. She is instrumental in collaborating with the ESE team and ESOL team to schedule any student who is in need of support throughout the day. She does all other duties as assigned.
Brandt, Renee	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Brandt runs the ESE program. Sandpiper Shores has 10 self-contained ESE classrooms for students with autism. Ms. Brant is responsible for scheduling teachers, students, and paras. She is an LEA and conducts all IEP meetings for our students with autism as well as our SLD and language impaired students. She troubleshoots with teachers and the staff and organizes professional development for the staff as it pertains to ESE.
Maione, Kerry	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Maione is our ELL coordinator. She runs the ELL program by scheduling students into classrooms based on levels. She conducts LEP parent meetings, oversees the staff which includes 3 ESOL teachers and 2 Community Language Facilitators. She works collaboratively with her staff and the teachers to develop goals for the students. She actively participates in SBT meetings and analyzes data. She works closely with our support staff to help organize tier 2 and tier 3 interventions for students in the ELL program.

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.

-Through Parent Training events we support families with sessions facilitated by our CARE team (counselors), teachers that specialize in ELA, teachers that specialize in math, ESE and ELL teachers and the Administrative team.

-The School Behavior Health Professional (BHP) supports that mental health and social and emotional needs of our learners. The SBHP position started in 2019 as part of the Marjory Stoneman Douglass High School public Safety Act to have more mental health professionals in schools. This position has constantly improved and supported the mental health of the students on our campus.

-Our ELL Coordinator and ELL School Counselor work together with the District Multicultural team to ensure the effective implementation of programs and services provided to our ELL students and families.

- A school district officer is on campus daily ensuring the safety and security of students and staff. Our school has a single point of entry for everyone. Fortify Florida app is on every computer and device and students are made aware of how to access and use this app in classroom visits by admin and the officer.

The "Raptor System" is used to sign parents and visitors in before entry onto our campus.

-School Counselors work together with school-based and district-based McKinney-Vento liaisons to ensure the needs of our students and families are being met.

-Having a large ASD population at our site, our ESE Coordinator works together with District ESE personnel and students and families to ensure needed school-based and community-based supports and resources are provided.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP is a living document that will be monitored, revised, and updated throughout the year as needed.

We strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:

? Data Analysis,

? Classroom walks,

? Student attendance,

? Data Chats,

? Formal Observations,

? Professional Learning Communities attendance/participation,

? Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology.

Monitoring will take place throughout the year. We will monitor mastery of grade level benchmarks through the use of Common Assessments, District Diagnostics: FSQs & USAs, NGSQs, iReady Diagnostics and instruction in reading and math, Imagine Learning, Khan Academy, FAST Progress Monitoring, Florida Standard Assessments, and Teacher made assessments. The Unit Assessments will occur at the end of each unit of study. The FAST assessments will occur three times a year (PM1, 2, & 3 in English Language Arts and Math).

The annual test administered for ELL students is WIDA ACCESS. The WIDA is used to assess ELL students' proficiency in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Teachers are trained by the ESOL Coordinator to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction based on the results of data.

The annual test for ESE students is the FSAA. The FSAA is used to assess ESE students' proficiency in all content areas to include: English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science. Teachers are trained by the ESE Coordinator to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction, based on the results of data.

Professional Learning Communities come together every other week for each grade level. During these meetings we analyze current data, discuss walkthrough trends, and adapt and modify instruction, discuss instructional strategies, and research and review best practices that will support our teams to reach their goals. These best practices are shared during Instructional Leadership Team meetings, Faculty Meetings, PLCs, and during our School Advisory Council meetings.

Teachers follow the scope and sequence as outlined on the Palm Beach County curriculum resource on blender and C-Palms. This ensures that teachers have a concrete timeline as well as the resources to provide quality instruction on the mandated curriculum. Employing frequent monitoring will allow us to adjust the instructional focus for remediation, remediating deficiencies before they become substantial.

In addition, we will be able individualize instruction to best meet the needs of our students, thus increasing student achievement.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	40	31	28	36	35	35	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	3	1	3	2	2	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	52	67	57	50	30	25	0	0	0	281
Course failure in Math	21	27	51	46	28	30	0	0	0	203
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	18	26	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	31	29	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	22	20	21	23	16	26	0	0	0	128

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	32	34	46	51	40	39	0	0	0	242

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	7	6	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	27	28	27	30	37	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	13	29	35	56	17	0	0	0	150
Course failure in Math	0	10	17	29	17	9	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	13	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	44	14	13	0	0	0	71

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	11	17	30	34	22	0	0	0	114

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	27	28	27	30	37	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	13	29	35	56	17	0	0	0	150
Course failure in Math	0	10	17	29	17	9	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	13	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	44	14	13	0	0	0	71

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	11	17	30	34	22	0	0	0	114

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	67	53	53	76	59	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				75			78		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				70			67		
Math Achievement*	73	57	59	73	53	50	70		
Math Learning Gains				72			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			43		
Science Achievement*	69	54	54	67	59	59	64		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	77	56	59	60			59		

* 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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	54			
HSP	69			
MUL	89			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	61			

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	48			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	56			
HSP	70			

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%
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	61			

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	67			73			69					77
SWD	36			44			24				5	57
ELL	55			66			66				5	77
AMI												
ASN	83			100							2	
BLK	45			55			60				5	80
HSP	67			72			67				5	74
MUL	85			92							2	
PAC												
WHT	71			76			70				5	83
FRL	54			64			47				5	80

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	76	75	70	73	72	54	67					60
SWD	46	58	56	43	54	42	45					41
ELL	64	71	68	68	69	54	60					60
AMI												
ASN	75			75								

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
BLK	52	75		59	63							30
HSP	74	75	75	71	76	61	66					58
MUL	79	91		86	82							
PAC												
WHT	83	74	62	75	66	56	70					73
FRL	68	67	62	65	66	41	62					54

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	75	78	67	70	66	43	64					59
SWD	39	59	62	41	48	39	44					36
ELL	57	71	69	59	55	44	28					59
AMI												
ASN	93			93								
BLK	60	55		53	36		29					
HSP	68	80	71	67	64	41	54					59
MUL	74			79								
PAC												
WHT	83	81	73	74	77	70	79					59
FRL	68	75	61	61	56	28	46					58

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	56%	10%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	48%	16%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	54%	46%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	81%	57%	24%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	52%	15%	61%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	56%	15%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	51%	12%	51%	12%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data below shares the achievement levels of our tested grade levels in all content areas:

FY19 FY22 FY23 (PM3)
 ELA Overall 77 76 68
 ELA Learning Gains 73 75 N/A
 ELA Low 25 60 70 N/A
 Math Overall 76 73 75
 Math Learning Gains 75 72 N/A
 Math Low 25 62 54 N/A
 Science 66 67 63

Our lowest performing subgroup is our SWD group. They performed as follows on the FY23 PM3 assessments:

ELA Grade 3: 34%
 ELA Grade 4: 55%
 ELA Grade 5: 24%
 Math Grade 3: 43%
 Math Grade 4: 53%

Math Grade 5: 22%
Science Grade 5: 16%

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 3rd grade reading. The percentage of students that were proficient as measured by PM3 was 64%. This was a drop of 9% from 73% in FY22. The contributing factors were as follows:

- Teachers were implementing a new ELA program last year, learning and implementing new set of standards, and they were preparing for a new computer-based test.
- Students did not have the stamina to complete the PM3 assessment to the best of their ability. The test was extremely long and took the entire day. Students were not prepared for the length of the test.
- Students were taking this new computer-based exam and in many cases they were not fully comfortable with the types of test items they were seeing on the assessment.

The subgroup that showed the lowest performance was our SWD subgroup. The contributing factors were as follows:

- We have a large population of students with disabilities that need to be mainstreamed into our general education classes. At times last year our general education classes became very large inhibiting the classroom teacher's ability to give all students the time needed to support their growth. Also, many of our SWD students have large learning gaps making on-grade level instruction very difficult for our SWD to access.

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

Again, the data component with the greatest decline was 3rd grade reading, decreasing 9% from 73% to 64%.

As stated above:

- Teachers were implementing a new ELA program last year, learning and implementing new set of standards, and they were preparing for a new computer-based test.
- Students did not have the stamina to complete the PM3 assessment to the best of their ability. The test was extremely long and took the entire day. Students were not prepared for the length of the test.
- Students were taking this new computer-based exam and in many cases they were not fully comfortable with the types of test items they were seeing on the assessment.

In addition to Grade 3 ELA we also saw a decline in the overall ELA proficiency levels from FY22 to FY23, from 76% to 68%. The main factor that contributed to this decline was the introduction in FY23 of new standards, new curriculum, and a new test. Teachers did not have a full grasp of what was being assessed, and how. Teachers also did not know exactly how well the new curriculum they were implementing would prepare students for the assessment, and how aligned the instruction was to the standards and to the test. Teachers did not introduce all of the computer-based test items until the later in the year and did not start off the year teaching students how to use the tools the computer provided. This year the teachers have decided to start off the year teaching these important skills so using the computer to test does not interact negatively with students being able to show proficiency.

We also saw a decline for our SWD in the area of science. Students proficiency levels decreased from 41% in 2021, to 35% in 2022, to 16% in 2023.

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.

We have positive data with regards to comparing our proficiency levels to the state. The following data set shares the comparisons between Sandpiper Shores and the State:

Sandpiper Shores ELA Proficiency: 68.4 (Greater by 18%)
 State ELA Proficiency: 50
 Sandpiper Shores Math Proficiency: 75% (Greater by 16%)
 State Math Proficiency: 59%
 Sandpiper Shores Science Proficiency: 63% (Greater by 12%)
 State Science Proficiency: 51%
 Sandpiper Shores ELA Grade 3: 64% (Greater by 14%)
 State ELA Grade 3: 50%
 Sandpiper Shores ELA Grade 4: 75% (Greater by 17%)
 State ELA Grade 4: 58%
 Sandpiper Shores ELA Grade 5: 66% (Greater by 12%)
 State ELA Grade 5: 54%
 Sandpiper Shores Math Grade 3: 81% (Greater by 22%)
 State Math Grade 3: 59%
 Sandpiper Math Grade 4: 68% (Greater by 7%)
 State Math Grade 4: 61%
 Sandpiper Shores Math Grade 5: 71% (Greater by 16%)
 State Math Grade 5: 55%

The trend is determined to be that we consistently score higher than the State in all grade levels and for all subjects. The area where our score was closest to the state was in 4th grade math. The reason for this is due to our 4th grade AMP (Accelerated math Program) students take the 5th grade test. That said, our high achieving math students in 4th grade take the 5th grade test and are accounted for in the 5th grade cell.

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

Sandpiper Shores showed the most improvement in the following areas:

Grade 3 Math Overall: Our students were 57% proficient in 2021, 75% proficient in 2022, and 81% proficient in 2023.

Grade 4 ELA SWD: Our students were 32% proficient in 2021, 35% proficient in 2022, and 55% proficient in 2023.

Grade 4 Math SWD: Our students were 39% in 2021, 17% proficient in 2022, and 53% proficient in 2023.

Grade 3 Math ELL: Our students were 42% proficient in 2021, 60% proficient in 2022, and 73% proficient in 2023.

Our school made some changes in our math instruction that enabled many of our students to make academic gains in math. First off, our tutorial programs concentrated mostly on math and we had highly certified teachers that were great math teachers leading these sessions. We also started a new fluency program schoolwide using Reflex math where we challenged the students to learn their math facts and we rewarded them with many incentives as the students moved through the program. By focusing on math fact fluency many of our ESE and ELL students were able to make significant academic progress in math.

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

After looking at the EWS data one main area of concern would be our attendance data. We have many students that are absent 10% or more days each year. The data showed the following:

Kindergarten: 40 students

First Grade: 31 students
Second Grade: 28 students
Third Grade: 36 students
Fourth Grade: 35 students
Fifth Grade: 35 students
Total: 205 students

This is something that we will need to work on with regards to making sure our families know the importance of school attendance and implementing a targeted plan to track, monitor, and support families that are struggling in the area of getting their child to school.

The second area of concern is the amount of students that had a course failure in ELA. The data showed the following:

Kindergarten: 52 students
First Grade: 67 students
Second Grade: 57 students
Third Grade: 50 students
Fourth Grade: 30 students
Fifth Grade: 25 students
Total: 281 students

This focus goes hand and hand with our improvement goal of increasing 3rd grade reading from 64% to 70%. We will be following the same action outlined in this plan for all grades K-5 to ensure our students are proficient by 3rd grade and beyond.

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

1. PLCs focused on data analysis and planning daily targeted instruction using this data.
2. Continue small group double down instruction in ELA and Math classrooms ensuring general education and support teachers (ESE/ELL) are working together collaboratively to plan these small groups.
3. ELA Achievement and Growth for all subgroups by digging deeper into the standards and ensuring all instructional strategies and materials are aligned to the standards.
4. Reduce the amount of students that are absent from school daily through an attendance team that monitors and supports families as well as constant communication regarding the importance of school attendance.
5. Work together with our MTSS lead and teacher leaders to ensure the systems that have been created so that every student is getting exactly what they need when they need it through the MTSS process is in place, and all teachers are on the same page of knowing the how and when of referring students. Also, ensuring that all interventions are done with fidelity.

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 the 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.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

In alignment with Strategic Theme A: Academic Excellence and Growth we will work to accelerate student learning using innovative and differentiated approaches as to increase 3rd grade reading proficiency by 6%, from 64% to 70%. Through data analysis, we determined that we need to address the deficiencies we saw in FY23 in this area and better support and prepare our students, and school, to improve student outcomes and achieve excellence through targeted instructional practices and benchmark-aligned instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Third grade reading achievement will increase by 6%, from 64% to 70%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor progress on this goal throughout the year with various formative and summative assessments such as Benchmark Unit Assessments, FSQs, iReady data, District diagnostics, F.A.S.T. assessments, anecdotal data, etc. This data will analyzed and used for planning at PLC meetings and grade level meetings. We will periodically determine if students are making progress and adjust as necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monique Coyle (monique.coyle@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. Tier 1 & Tier 2 interventions utilizing research-based interventions. Use a variety of research-based interventions (LLI, Spire, Voyager, Rewards, etc.) as determined by the decision tree and the MTSS team to target and address areas of weakness.
2. Small Group differentiated instruction. Plan differentiated, small group instruction using a double down approach in conjunction with support staff. Monitor progress regularly and revise instruction accordingly.
3. Teachers will be provided professional development opportunities including through District support teams, team trainings during PLC, collaborative discussions, in-school coaching opportunities, and instructional rounds. During common planning/PLC meetings we are working to increase each grade level's capacity as a whole and to develop strong teachers that in turn, accelerate learning for all students.
4. Strategically plan for a variety of monitoring/data tracking including: Data chats with teachers, Classroom walks, Formal and Informal Observations, Adaptive Technology Programs, and all Formative and Summative Assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Tiering students helps us understand what the strengths and areas of improvements are for each student. The goal is to accelerate each student's learning by targeting foundational skills and strategies, and supporting their individual needs as they move towards grade level and standards mastery.
2. Small group instruction ensures students are given the additional support they need to achieve at their level, through both remediation and enrichment. It allows for continuous sustained progress monitoring and allows teachers to deliver individualized instruction.
3. Professional Learning Communities and PD opportunities are dedicated learning the new B.E.S.T. standards to ensure that teachers are aligned with their core instruction as to support all learners. PLCs allow for teachers to collaborate and learn from each other and to plan for classroom and student needs.
4. By using the data tracking tools teachers and leaders are able to monitor student progress and adapt when necessary.

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.

Tiering of students will begin in August and be monitored throughout the year using data.

- a. Review and analyze data to identify each student's areas of weakness and create and communicate a plan to progress monitor regularly.
- b. Identify staff who will offer additional support/remediation.
- c. Adjust interventions and instruction based on various data measures at intervals throughout the year .
- d. Progress monitor small group instruction based on student need as determined through consistent assessment data and observation.
- e. Leadership team along with the resource team meet to make decisions on each student to provide appropriate support through tier 2 and 3 interventions by qualified staff as determined by the decision tree.
- f. Monitoring occurs through data analysis of various assessment measures (AP, SAI, Guidance, Resource).

Person Responsible: Monique Coyle (monique.coyle@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: The tiering of students will begin in September and will continue throughout the year.

Small group Instruction

- a. Teachers analyze data through PLCs and team meetings utilizing a variety of measures; FSQs, Benchmark Unit Assessments, iReady, ORR, District Diagnostics, etc.
- b. Teachers group the students based on commonalities and needs.
- c. Teachers determine whether students need foundational skills, guided reading and, or skills/strategy groups.
- d. Teachers plan their instruction for groups utilizing research-based strategies on predetermined skills.
- e. Teachers utilize on-going formative assessments such as ORR, FSQ/USA, iReady Diagnostics, District Diagnostics, etc to adapt instruction.
- f. Monitoring will occur through administrative data chats and developing action plans, progress monitoring using data from multiple assessments, and participation of administration at PLCs.

Person Responsible: Beth Bickler (beth.bickler@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: This will begin in August and adaptations will occur every two weeks during PLC/planning meetings.

PLCs will take place weekly (one with a facilitator and one with a grade level facilitator):

- a. Plan core instruction through backwards design using our District's curriculum, B.E.S.T. standards and clarifications, and current data, both formative and summative.
- b. Use only vetted resources to plan for effective and relevant instruction and ensure that all materials are rigorous and relevant.
- c. Conduct PLC meetings with support staff to discuss strategies, interventions and resources to ensure the use of complex text, task and talk.
- d. Conduct data chats with all teachers to identify students and action plan and then ongoing progress monitoring to ensure our plan is improving achievement.
- e. Monitoring will occur through attendance of PLCs by administration, student data analysis, as well as data chats and roster checks (AP, PLC Leader).

Person Responsible: Monique Coyle (monique.coyle@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: This will occur biweekly from August until May.

4. Data Tracking our Adaptive Technology

- a. Provide teachers with professional development so they can effectively track student progress using our adaptive technology programs.
- b. Develop class plan/schedule that ensures all students have an appropriate amount of time to utilize these programs.
- c. Teachers analyze this data during PLCs and create small group opportunities for students to master the content.
- d. School leaders monitor and track this data to engage in data chats with teachers about student needs.
- e. School leaders/teachers monitor and track this data to engage in data chats with students about their progress.

Person Responsible: Sheila Boone (sheila.boone@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: This will occur throughout the year when timely data is collected.

#2. 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.

Another area of focus around Positive Culture and Climate is our Early Warning System indicator of attendance. We have 149 students enrolled in our school this year that were absent 10% or more days last year. Our rationale is that chronic absences can translate into students having difficulty learning to read by the third grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce the number of students with 90% or more absences from 149 students to 115 students.

Monitoring:

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

We will create monitoring systems for these students through our Behavioral Health Team, Check-Ins, adult and peer mentors, and monitoring of their data at Leadership Team meetings and Professional Learning Communities to ensure these students are making gains academically, and socially, depending on their need. The leadership team will work closely with our attendance team in monitoring these students as most of the students with more than one EWI have attendance as one of the markers, so this area of concern directly ties to the attendance concern stated above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monique Coyle (monique.coyle@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.)

The interventions we will be implementing are as follows:

1. Cultivate a school wide culture of attendance through school wide initiatives to increase attendance. (Including a grade level competition, regular school messaging to parents, mentors for students showing a need, and check ins with our Behavioral Health Team.)
2. Use chronic absence data to determine need for additional supports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are multi-faceted and involve many school stakeholders. Using current data we will target students and families most needing support and provide them with any necessary resources or information needed to ensure their child is attending school. We will create a culture of attendance through parent communication channels, and give our school staff the tools they need to support the students. Mentoring, check-ins and creating that culture of connection is necessary to help our students and families in this area.

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. Develop a communication plan to create a culture of attendance.

The Principal will map out monthly communications that will be provided to families on a calendar. (Through the parent newsletter, social media, Class Dojo and Parentlink.)

Person Responsible: Monique Coyle (monique.coyle@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 10/1/2023

2. Develop an attendance team, set up roles and responsibilities, and develop a cadence of accountability within the team ensuring they are using data to identify students in need in a timely and accurate manner.

Person Responsible: Traci Rice (traci.rice@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 10/1/2023

3. Reach out to frequently absent students in a supportive manner to inquire about why they are missing school and to see if the school can provide support.

Person Responsible: Traci Rice (traci.rice@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: On-going throughout the year

4. Create a schoolwide initiative that enhances student awareness of the importance of attendance and incentivizes student attendance with rewards and recognition.

Person Responsible: Monique Coyle (monique.coyle@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 10/1/23

5. Develop a mentoring plan for students with attendance issues in which they check-in each morning with a trusted adult and that adult supports the monitoring of that child's attendance.

Person Responsible: Dahlia Lessne (dahlia.lessne@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 11/1/23

In addition we will implement the following with regards to positive culture and environment:

Policy 2.09 and Required Instruction Florida State Statute 1003.42

Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:

- (g) History of Holocaust
- (h) History of Africans and African Americans
- (i) History of Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders
- (o) Health Education, Life Skills & Social Media
- (q) Hispanic Contributions
- (r) Women's Contributions
- (t) Civic & Character Education
- (u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.

Our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts.

Person Responsible: Monique Coyle (monique.coyle@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: On-going throughout the year