

The School District of Palm Beach County

Citrus Cove 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 | 13 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 24 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Citrus Cove Elementary School

8400 LAWRENCE RD, Boynton Beach, FL 33436

<https://cces.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.

Citrus Cove Elementary is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his and/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.

Citrus Cove 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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Cromwell, Natalie | Principal | As the school leader, the school principal oversees all academic initiatives, safety issues, facilities management, personnel organizational structures, and student and family concerns. |
| Cruz, O'Mayra | Assistant Principal | The role of the assistant principal is to support and co-lead all school-wide decisions around instructional practices, safety, protocols, and school-wide culture collaboratively with the school principal. She supports teachers with instructional practices, communicates with parents, and provides administrative support in all areas of the school. |
| Orloski, Heather | Teacher, PreK | As Pre-K co-leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading and organizing grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving. |
| Robson, Michelle | Teacher, PreK | As a co-leader in Pre-K, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, are leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Fox , Samantha | Teacher, K-12 | As a grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Reid, Melissa | Teacher, K-12 | As a grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem-solving with grade level issues. |
| Romano, Jessica | Teacher, K-12 | As a grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Grandis, Lorretta | Teacher, K-12 | As a grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|----------------|---|
| | | supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Lyons, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | As grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Goldstein, Sydney | Teacher, K-12 | As grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Gallego, Marya | Teacher, K-12 | As grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Dockswell, Marni | Teacher, K-12 | As a grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Morien, Julia | Teacher, K-12 | As a grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Colletta, Shannon | Reading Coach | As the Instructional Coach for Grades 3-5, Ms. Colletta supports all homeroom teachers with the implementation of all curriculum programs and intervention programs. She supports teachers one to one and in PLC meetings twice a month. She reviews student data and provides structures on how to support students in need of intervention and/or enrichment. |
| Lasure, Bonnie | Teacher, K-12 | As a grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|----------------|--|
| Barica, Rosemarie | Teacher, K-12 | As the Team Chair for Fine Arts, Ms. Barica creates the fine Arts schedule for the school and provides administration feedback regarding anything relevant to the Fine Arts teachers and time block. She leads the Fine Arts PLCs and supports the implementation of the STEAM program through the lens of the Fine Arts teachers. She supports her team by acting as a liaison between the Fine Arts teachers and administration. |
| Baptista, Jessica | Teacher, K-12 | As a grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| Brown, Jessica | Other | As the ESOL Coordinator and team leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with ELL planning and scheduling services for students, and helping with problem-solving. |
| Correia, Sandra | Reading Coach | As the Instructional Coach for Grades 3-5, Ms. Colletta supports all homeroom teachers with the implementation of all curriculum programs and intervention programs. She supports teachers one to one and in PLC meetings twice a month. She reviews student data and provides structures on how to support students in need of intervention and/or enrichment. |
| Sappia, Lien | Teacher, K-12 | As a grade leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with planning instruction, and helping with problem solving with grade level issues. |
| soto, luz | Teacher, ESE | As ESE Coordinator and team leader, her duties and responsibilities are, but not limited to, leading grade level PLCs, communicating administrative directives to the entire team, supporting team members with IEP planning and scheduling services for students, and helping with problem solving. |

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.

Citrus Cove Elementary values the opportunities for all stakeholders to be a part of the decision-making process at the school. Stakeholders are always informed of school changes, regulations, procedures, and any opportunity to hear and discuss pertinent decisions for the school. All stakeholders are informed through weekly call-outs, monthly principal newsletter, school letters (translated into Spanish and Haitian Creole), meetings (including Faculty/staff, Parent Teacher Organization -PTO, School Advisory Council - SAC), and open door policy instilled by both the Principal and Assistant Principal.

Monthly School Advisory Council meetings are most effective in getting stakeholders involved in the decision-making process and soliciting their feedback in the SIP development process. All parents, guardians, staff members, and community members are invited to attend this meeting. Stakeholders are invited to the monthly meetings. The entire stakeholder community gets an opportunity to hear and discuss school-wide concerns and proposed decisions regarding things that impact students. Voting members have an opportunity to vote on these decisions. Minutes of the meeting are taken and reviewed and approved prior to the start of each meeting.

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 School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a living document that requires frequent monitoring and reminds school leaders if the school goals, identified in the SIP, are being followed and monitored. The SIP becomes the focal document used to identify students with academic needs. The SIP houses the student populations that are the center of the intervention and highlight the specific interventions needed to attain the school goals. In January, after students take the district and state-level assessments, the SIP is revisited to determine what changes need to be made to the academic plan devised to support students. The revisions are made and submitted to the district for approval. After January, the new implementation is in place while teachers and administration monitor and analyze the data derived from the 2nd window of diagnostics and assessments. Instructional coaches alter their schedules for teacher support and PLC focus shifts to support school-wide goals (by grade level). Data chats are scheduled for each teacher K-5 grades and interventions/enrichment are established for the rest of the year.

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 | 73% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 96% |
| 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) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) |

| | |
|---|---|
| (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B |
| 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 | 54 | 51 | 34 | 44 | 28 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 242 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 41 | 55 | 43 | 53 | 36 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 246 | |
| Course failure in Math | 16 | 27 | 33 | 32 | 39 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 33 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 51 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 63 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | |

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 | 26 | 39 | 24 | 53 | 46 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 223 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 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 | 53 | 40 | 43 | 32 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 15 | 38 | 37 | 41 | 30 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | |
| Course failure in Math | 9 | 23 | 14 | 26 | 17 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 18 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 30 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 39 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 | |

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 | 14 | 27 | 20 | 53 | 33 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 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 | 53 | 40 | 43 | 32 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 15 | 38 | 37 | 41 | 30 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | |
| Course failure in Math | 9 | 23 | 14 | 26 | 17 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 18 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 30 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 39 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 | |

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 | 14 | 27 | 20 | 53 | 33 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 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* | 60 | 53 | 53 | 63 | 59 | 56 | 57 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 76 | | | 61 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60 | | | 59 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 56 | 57 | 59 | 58 | 53 | 50 | 47 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 74 | | | 36 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 65 | | | 21 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 60 | 54 | 54 | 51 | 59 | 59 | 43 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 54 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 47 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 53 | 56 | 59 | 57 | | | 53 | | |

* 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 | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 288 |
| 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 | 63 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 504 |
| 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 | 31 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | 42 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 72 | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 50 | | | |
| MUL | 65 | | | |
| 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 | 73 | | | |
| FRL | 49 | | | |

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 | 42 | | | |
| ELL | 58 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 76 | | | |
| BLK | 60 | | | |
| HSP | 61 | | | |
| MUL | 62 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| FRL | 58 | | | |

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 | 60 | | | 56 | | | 60 | | | | | 53 |
| SWD | 28 | | | 32 | | | 25 | | | | 5 | 48 |
| ELL | 38 | | | 41 | | | 36 | | | | 5 | 53 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 65 | | | 81 | | | 82 | | | | 4 | 60 |
| BLK | 58 | | | 44 | | | 56 | | | | 5 | 55 |
| HSP | 49 | | | 49 | | | 57 | | | | 5 | 49 |

| 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 | 70 | | | 60 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | | | 74 | | | 63 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 49 | | | 47 | | | 49 | | | | 5 | 51 |

| 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 | 63 | 76 | 60 | 58 | 74 | 65 | 51 | | | | | 57 |
| SWD | 29 | 51 | 46 | 32 | 54 | 46 | 19 | | | | | 61 |
| ELL | 48 | 75 | 68 | 44 | 73 | 64 | 33 | | | | | 57 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | 80 | | 82 | 85 | | | | | | | 58 |
| BLK | 58 | 75 | 59 | 50 | 75 | 65 | 47 | | | | | 52 |
| HSP | 55 | 78 | 71 | 46 | 72 | 63 | 45 | | | | | 60 |
| MUL | 60 | 58 | | 52 | 77 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 75 | 40 | 77 | 71 | | 63 | | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 71 | 58 | 49 | 70 | 63 | 42 | | | | | 57 |

| 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 | 57 | 61 | 59 | 47 | 36 | 21 | 43 | | | | | 53 |
| SWD | 33 | 52 | 55 | 31 | 39 | 25 | 17 | | | | | 52 |
| ELL | 35 | 53 | 61 | 32 | 31 | 17 | 19 | | | | | 53 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 77 | | | 84 | | | | | | | | 50 |
| BLK | 46 | 50 | 53 | 31 | 21 | 8 | 24 | | | | | 49 |
| HSP | 50 | 70 | 71 | 40 | 33 | 13 | 38 | | | | | 54 |
| MUL | 58 | 67 | | 50 | 50 | | 42 | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 58 | | 63 | 47 | | 60 | | | | | |

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 | 47 | 58 | 57 | 37 | 31 | 18 | 31 | | | | | 55 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 67% | 56% | 11% | 54% | 13% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 58% | 0% | 58% | 0% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 48% | 8% | 50% | 6% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 54% | 46% | 54% | 46% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 57% | 57% | 0% | 59% | -2% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 52% | -10% | 61% | -19% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 56% | 8% | 55% | 9% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 51% | 7% | 51% | 7% |

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.

Across grade levels, the subgroup, and core content areas, Citrus Cove Elementary demonstrated an area of improvement in Grade 3 & 4 ELA and Grade 4 Math. Both content areas posed a significant challenge for 4th-grade students. The students demonstrated a -15% decrease in ELA proficiency in the 2022-2023 school year and a -14% in Math as compared to the prior year. The contributing factor that led to this decrease was the historic Covid slide where many of the students were not in attendance and were challenged by virtual schooling and rigorous instructional work without targeted support. Students returned to schooling with major struggles in foundational reading and math instruction. Teachers have been working diligently to close the achievement gap of these students who still today, struggle with math fluency and a multitude of reading skills.

Although grade 3 demonstrated a +2 increase in ELA as compared to the prior year, the 3rd-grade group showed the least overall proficiency among the intermediate grades. On the other hand, the same group of students scored a 58% on the F.A.S.T Math assessment which was a 7% increase from the previous year. The contributing factor responsible for the low performance of 3rd graders is the lack of a phonics program in the primary grades which focuses on teaching the fundamental skills of reading. Many of our students were unable to decode words and read fluently. Later, lack of comprehension became a bigger factor in the third grade. The dire need for a rich phonic and phonemic awareness program was urgently necessary.

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

It is evident that the current 5th grade cohort demonstrated an area of improvement in both ELA and Math. Both content areas posed a significant challenge for 4th-grade students. The students demonstrated a 59% proficiency level which was a -15% decrease in ELA proficiency in the 2022-2023 school year (the prior year was 74%) and a 42% proficiency which was a -14% in Math as compared to the prior year (56% in 2022). The contributing factor that led to this decrease was the historic Covid slide where many of the students were not in attendance and were challenged by virtual schooling. Rigorous instructional work without targeted support was a recipe for disaster where students were not consistently remediated to close their achievement gaps. Students returned to schooling with major struggles in foundational reading and math instruction. Teachers have been working diligently to close the achievement gap of these students who still today, struggle with math fluency and a multitude of reading skills.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 4th-grade Math results. Citrus Cove Elementary lagged behind with a 42% Math proficiency while the state scored 61% proficiency in F.A.S.T Math results. Overall, our 4th-grade students of 2022-2023, had a -14% math proficiency as compared to the previous year (overall proficiency for FY 22 was 56%). The factor that contributed to this gap students struggled in the earlier grades with math fluency and step by step math problems. These skills are essential for math fluency and problem-solving. This group of students were virtual students during Covid in their earlier years. The students struggled with math proficiency and critical thinking skills associated with mathematical analysis and logic.

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

Citrus Cove Elementary (CCES) surpassed the state average in ELA proficiency across 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Citrus Cove 3rd grade level results showed 55% -state average was 50%, CCES 4th grade scored 59%- state average 58%, and CCES 5th grade scored 67%- state average was 54%. In Math, 5th and 6th grades surpassed the state by 9% where CCES scored 64% and 100% respectively and the state scored 54% for 5th grade and 47% for 6th grade Math.

The improvements were a result of our summer planning session on how to implement the new

Benchmark curriculum for grades 3-5 in ELA. Teachers worked in grade levels teams to discuss planning, implementation, intervention, and small group lesson for all students. Data chats with homeroom teachers and administration, also took place to discuss district-level assessments, diagnostics, and state assessments Progress Monitoring in the first and second window. Teachers analyzed student data and the team decided on an intervention, tutorial, and a double dose of intervention in the classroom setting. Approximately, 75% of the students who attended tutorial groups after school demonstrated a one to two-level growth at the last Progress Monitoring window. Students also used Panther's Persevere, a test-taking strategy card protocol for students to use to be more successful on the test. Students utilized these cards in the classroom during instructional time and also when completing ELA and Math practice tests. The teachers and students who used this instructional tool with fidelity saw the most improvement in performance and achievement.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, the two areas of concern are Grade 5 Math and Grade 3 ELA. These two areas are concerning as the students in 5th grade scored lower than the state average in the previous year. The students lack several important Math foundational skills and therefore, are lagging behind their district and state peers.

In addition, as an early intervention to increase student readiness to enter Kindergarten, we offer Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Program supplemented with enrichment hours and a PreK self-contained program for students ages 3 to 5 determined eligible for exceptional student education based on goals and services as written on the Individual Education Plan. These programs are supported by the Department of Early Childhood Education and the Department of Exceptional Student Education and follow all Florida statutes, rules, and contractual mandates.

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.

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

Our most important priorities are improving 3rd-grade ELA from 55% to 58% and increasing 5th-grade Math proficiency from 42% to 50%. Last year's 5th-grade proficiency was 64%. As we already know, mastery in phonics and fluency helps third-grade students focus on comprehension. Since our third-grade students are performing at a 55% proficiency rate, we decided to administer a benchmark survey to understand the needs of students. Our third-grade students took a research-based Core Phonics Survey, to demonstrate which students are in dire need of intervention and support in phonics. Third grade currently has 170 students. Our priority is to ensure all third-grade students can read. Out of all

170 students, 54% of students scored below 3rd-grade level in phonics. In order to provide differentiated instruction for our third-grade students, we grouped students by needs based on the Core Phonics Survey. The teachers are using their Differentiated instruction time (in their master schedule) to provide targeted intervention for all third-grade students. Our instructional coaches will be assisting with supporting teachers and students. Tutorials will take place earlier to provide further support for all students who need it. The focus will enhance third-grade ELA skills in the areas of phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

Another area of priority is increasing 5th-grade Math proficiency from 42% to 50%. Last year's 5th-grade proficiency was 64%. Last year, teachers received targeted professional development in Math however, our students still lagged behind. This year, we have incorporated Reflex Math during the Math block to provide practice and review of math concepts. Our instructional coaches are providing one-to-one support for teachers and modeling of lessons. We are also disaggregating assessment data to highlight where students need the most support and providing after school tutorials for grades 3-5. Instructional coaches will be supporting new teachers with Math instruction in small group and whole group lessons. During PLCs, instructional coaches will assist teachers with scope and sequence, and data analysis of the assessment data.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

One area of focus at Citrus Cove Elementary is developing and maintaining a positive school-wide culture and environment for all students to grow and thrive. Although we already have many positive structures in place to create a positive learning environment, last year more discipline referrals were completed. On every grade level, there were two or more discipline referrals completed, with the exception of 4th & 5th grade which resulted in 5 and 6 discipline referrals, respectively. The positive culture has been challenged and is striving for more implementation of positive tiered reward systems and a school-wide culture that is clear and reinforced each day.

One of the proposed ideas is to incorporate and implement a positive-tiered system that will work alongside the already established Panther Expectations (Panther Pledge), Panther ticket system, and Panther parties (checks system). The tiered system would work closely with the ticket system to demonstrate the completion of 80% of checks in a month. Students would receive lanyards and special reward sticks to place on their lanyards each month for showing great behavior in the classroom, Fine Arts, cafeteria, and throughout the campus. Students will have multiple opportunities to earn a lanyard and other rewards. Parents and guardians will be informed of student effort and positive behavior. Students who display monthly success with the checks system are often succeeding academically and socially.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Citrus Cove Elementary is developing and maintaining a positive school-wide culture and environment for all students to grow and thrive. Although we already have many positive structures in place to create a positive learning environment, last year more discipline referrals were completed. On every grade level, there were two or more discipline referrals completed, with the exception of 4th & 5th grade which resulted in 5 and 6 discipline referrals, respectively. The positive culture has been challenged and is striving for more implementation of positive tiered reward systems and a school-wide culture that is clear and reinforced each day. The intent is to reduce discipline referrals to 1 in grades K-3 and 2-3 at most, in grades 4 and 5th grade for the entire year.

We plan on achieving this goal by incorporating and implementing a positive-tiered system that will work alongside the already established Panther Expectations (Panther Pledge), Panther ticket system, and Panther parties (checks system). The tiered system would work closely with the ticket system to demonstrate the completion of 80% of checks in a month. Students would receive lanyards and special reward sticks to place on their lanyards each month for showing great behavior in the classroom, Fine Arts, cafeteria, and throughout the campus. Students will have multiple opportunities to earn a lanyard and other rewards. Parents and guardians will be informed of student effort and positive behavior.

This expectation will be reinforced by the entire school campus and community. Students will be held accountable for following these standards and procedures. Parents and guardians will be fully informed of the growth and positivity this new system has provided their child and school as a whole. Data will be collected throughout (teacher data using the checks system) and administration overseeing discipline referrals. This expectation is relevant to the Panther Expectations we have established already and the maintenance of our school-wide culture and climate. We have high expectations for our scholars and we work tirelessly to ensure a positive and equitable learning environment for all to learn and thrive. Our plan and actions are closely aligned with our school vision and mission and also with the district's Strategic Plan to provide academic excellence while providing an equitable learning environment for students to reach their highest potential.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by all homeroom teachers who will collect and gather students' positive behavior using the checks system. Each student's name is on a grid showing each month and the number of checks they receive each month. The goal is for every student to achieve 80% of their checks in a month. Every student in K-5th grades who achieves that goal will be rewarded a lanyard. Later in the month, they will receive a reward stick to place on the lanyard. The lanyards are a visible representation of the positive behavior students are displaying throughout the campus. The data is recorded and collected by the School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) Chair and team. The team reviews and analyzes the data to make the necessary changes to the SWPBS system. We also compare it to discipline referrals to ensure those students are receiving counseling and/or mental/behavioral health support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Cromwell (natalie.cromwell@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 goal is for every student to achieve 80% of their checks in a month. Students who do not achieve 80% of their checks in the month participate in a special presentation and reteach positive expectations as their intervention for meeting the goal. The teacher(s) review the Panther Expectations and ask students to complete an activity that reinforces the behaviors the students are to exhibit on a daily basis. Homeroom teachers review the expectations daily and help students understand the school-wide expectations. The expectations are explained to parents and guardians during Meet & Greet and Curriculum Night. We rely on our parents and guardians to be our partners in ensuring students demonstrate positive behaviors throughout the day.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who have attained 80% of their checks, by the end of the month, are invited to a Panther Party to celebrate their success. While students are engaged in fun activities, the other students attend an interactive and engaging activity to reteach and learn the Panther Expectations. This helps students understand the importance of these expectations but also the positive outcome if and when they earn their 80% checks.

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.

The monthly data is recorded and collected by the School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) Chair and team. The team reviews and analyzes the data to make the necessary changes to the SWPBS system. We also compare it to discipline referrals to ensure those students are receiving counseling and/or mental/behavioral health support. The school administration will support and monitor any needs that arise.

Person Responsible: Marni Dockswell (marni.dockswell@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: At the end of each month.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The second area of focus is increasing 3rd-grade F.A.S.T ELA scores from 55% proficiency to 58% proficiency by PM3 at the end of the 2023-2024 school year. It is imperative for our third-grade students to improve their reading skills in order to perform at or above the state and district proficiency outcomes. Last year, our current third-grade students scored 65% proficiency on the STAR Renaissance assessment by the end of the 2022-2023 school year. We anticipate students will demonstrate an even greater increase in this year's F.A.S.T third grade ELA test.

Measurable Outcome:

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

increasing 3rd-grade F.A.S.T ELA scores from 55% proficiency to 58% proficiency by PM3 at the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored closely by both teachers and administration. A data sheet was created to demonstrate how any given student is performing on all assessments leading to PM3 (the final assessment). Teacher and administrator data chats will be conducted as well as data chats between the teacher and students. At these data chats, the data will be analyzed and discussed and interventions will be developed to help support students who need more practice with skills and strategies. Afterschool tutorials will also be provided to help support the lowest 25% and also "bubble" students who need extra skills and strategies to improve their ELA proficiency and score. Parents will also be notified of students' progress and will be directed on how they can support the student at home. Also, we will be hosting a Parent Literacy Night where parents can learn how to teach students how to read.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Cromwell (natalie.cromwell@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 evidence-based intervention used for this Area of Focus is the students' PM1 scores, ORR results, Core Phonics survey, USA, and other assessments. Students are identified as having a need and the intervention is tailored to address the need(s) of individual students. The intervention will be provided by the homeroom teachers. The intervention will be targeted small group instruction (using the UFLI phonics research-based program) to provide intense reading instruction for all students who are ready below grade level (based on iReady window 1 data). Also, intervention will be provided during afterschool tutorials (also by homeroom teachers) using the same UFLI program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We chose to use UFLI as the intervention to provide students who are one grade level or more below grade level. The program is a research-based program used to improve literacy outcomes for children learning to read. We have found, in our primary data, that students who are not strong in phonics or phonemic awareness cannot comprehend reading passages and answer questions. This program will help bridge the achievement gap and give students the skills and strategies needed to excel in ELA.

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.

Teachers will provide targeted UFLI instruction to students who are one level or more below grade level. This intervention will occur during Differentiated Instruction time every day for 30 minutes. Teachers will cycle various groups of students to ensure all students are receiving what they need. In the mid-year, after PM2, student groups will be adjusted to determine who needs to continue with this program and who will move on to targeted comprehension intervention.

Person Responsible: Natalie Cromwell (natalie.cromwell@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Students will increase ELA proficiency by May 2024. Data will be monitored throughout the year and targeted student groups will be changing based on student needs using various assessments to help determine the exact needs of students.

Students will participate in a 6-8 week tutorial intervention program held after school twice a week. Students will be invited to work in a small group (approximately 10-12 students) to work with a teacher on reading skills. The UFLI program will be utilized to support students' reading skills and strategies.

Person Responsible: Melissa Reid (melissa.a.reid@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Students will have two cycles of tutorial sessions if it is determined they need more intense intervention. Also, the PM2 outcomes will determine who are the students who will participate in the two rounds of tutorials. The two cycles are from October -January and January to April of 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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