

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Acreage Pines Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>13</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>18</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>26</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

# Acreage Pines Elementary School

14200 ORANGE BLVD, Loxahatchee, FL 33470

<https://apes.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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

Acreage Pines Community Elementary is committed to providing students with a safe and challenging academic environment where each child can reach their highest potential and succeed in the global community by developing citizenship, accountability, respect, and exploration in the fields of Biomedical and Veterinary Technology.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Acreage Pines Elementary is growing respectful, inquiring, global learners within a happy, caring and stimulating environment where children will recognize and achieve their fullest potential, so that they can be successful within society.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

#### **School Leadership Team**

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

| Name               | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------------|----------------|--|
| Baker, Brent       | Teacher, K-12  | As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between the school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's including instructional support, parent communication, and grade-wide activities. At Acreage Pines, Grade Chairs also serve as PLC leader coordinating academic collaboration and data review among school teams. Grade chairs report each month to SIP on their action steps and progress toward goals. |
| Lanham, Jessica    | Teacher, K-12  | As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between the school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's including instructional support, parent communication, and grade-wide activities. At Acreage Pines, Grade Chairs also serve as PLC leader coordinating academic collaboration and data review among school teams. Grade chairs report each month to SIP on their action steps and progress toward goals. |
| Serpenti, Michelle | Teacher, K-12  | As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between the school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's including instructional support, parent communication, and grade-wide activities. At Acreage Pines, Grade Chairs also serve as PLC leader coordinating academic collaboration and data review among school teams. Grade chairs report each month to SIP on their action steps and progress toward goals. |
| Kolesar, Corrie    | Teacher, K-12  | As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between the school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's including instructional support, parent communication, and grade-wide activities. At Acreage Pines, Grade Chairs also serve as PLC leader coordinating academic collaboration and data review among school teams. Grade chairs report each month to SIP on their action steps and progress toward goals. |
| Goolsby, Regina    | Teacher, PreK  | As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between the school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's including instructional support, parent communication, and grade-wide activities. At Acreage Pines, Grade Chairs also serve as PLC leader coordinating academic collaboration and data review among school teams. Grade chairs report each month to SIP on their action steps and progress toward goals. |
|                    | Teacher, ESE   | As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between the school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's including instructional support, parent communication, and grade-wide activities. At Acreage Pines, Grade Chairs also serve as PLC leader coordinating academic collaboration  |

| Name               | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
|                    |                     | and data review among school teams. Grade chairs report each month to SIP on their action steps and progress toward goals.   |
| Garrett, Theresa   | Teacher, K-12       | As grade chair, responsibilities include serving as a liaison between the school's leadership team and teachers in their grade level, Grade Level Chairs lead and coordinate the grade-level team's including instructional support, parent communication, and grade-wide activities. At Acreage Pines, Grade Chairs also serve as PLC leader coordinating academic collaboration and data review among school teams. Grade chairs report each month to SIP on their action steps and progress toward goals. Theresa also serves as SAC chair.   |
| LaVigna, Christie  | Teacher, K-12       | As the media specialist, Ms. Lavigna supports the reading goals at Acreage Pines. She integrates reading curriculum into the media center based on current data. Additionally, she uses a portion of her schedule to push into classrooms to support reading and writing instruction and intervention.   |
| Lee, Jason         | Behavior Specialist | To work with teachers and parents to make sure that students have the proper tools and guidance to effectively learn within their skill sets. They also ensure that curricula and programs address the social emotional, developmental and behavioral needs of students.and to assist with acquisition of co-located and community services.   |
| Ohm, Jennifer      | School Counselor    | To work with teachers and parents to make sure that students have the proper tools and guidance to effectively learn within their skill sets. They also ensure that curricula and programs address the social emotional, developmental and educational needs of students. To assist with acquisition of colocated and community resources and services when needed.  |
| Dettling, Megan    | Assistant Principal | As the Assistant Principal, Mrs. Dettling supports professional learning and collaboration amongst teachers and resource staff and facilitates and leads professional learning focused on content, instruction, and pedagogical content knowledge. She must demonstrate through daily decisions and actions that the school's priority is academic success for every student. The Assistant Principal assists with eliminating barriers and distractions that interfere with effective teaching and learning. Supports the principal in building a culture of pride, trust, and respect. Monitors the implementation of cultural competence, equity, and access within the instructional practices at the school center. She also monitors and improves instruction by visiting classrooms to support and monitor instruction. |
| Karbowski, Darline | Principal           | The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee  |



| Name              | Position Title            | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------|---------------------------|--|
|                   |                           | facilities. Mrs. Winewski reflects on competing priorities and focuses attention on those that will have the greatest leverage in improving instruction and learning. Mrs. Winewski deepens the understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college and career readiness. |
| Fleming, Kristina | ELL Compliance Specialist | As the school ESOL Contact, Mrs. Fleming assists the school staff with ensuring ESOL program compliance. She collaborates with community agencies and organizations in assisting families to access available resources. She provides support to ESOL students through push-in support, coordinates assessments, and monitors through data.  |

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

- +The School Behavior Health Professional (SBHP) supports the behavioral and mental health of students and works along with the school counselors. 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.
- +Through Parent Trainings we support families with educational workshops facilitated by our school counselors, Behavior Health Professional, Co-located Therapist, reading and math coaches, ESOL, ESE, and Single School Culture Coordinators and the Administrative Team.
- +Our ESOL Coordinator works in conjunction with the District's multicultural department to ensure the fidelity of implementation of programs and services designed to improve the outcomes of English Language Learners.
- +A District Migrant Liaison works with our ESOL Coordinator and ESOL School Counselor to provide school and community support services for families of migrant students. These supports are supplemental to school-wide supports for students and families.
- + A school district officer is on campus every day for the safety and security of all students and staff. The school has one point of entry for everyone. Fortify Florida Application is on every computer, and students are made aware of this in our assemblies. The "Raptor System" is used to sign parents/visitors before they can go to a classroom, or school event on campus.
- +Guidance Counselors work in partnership with families and the District McKinney-Vento liaison to ensure the needs of these families and students are met. These supports are supplemental to school-wide supports for students and families. Our ESOL Coordinator and ESOL School Counselor work in conjunction with the District's Multicultural Department to ensure the implementation with fidelity of programs and services designed to improve the outcomes of our English Language Learners.

### **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 captures the continuous improvement work we do at Acreage Pines. The SIP is updated throughout the year to ensure proper documentation of what we do. Continuous improvement is at the forefront of what we do. We work collaboratively to review and analyze data. We make decisions based on the data to ensure all students receive the necessary support and accommodations during instruction. Our team works towards the following student achievement goals:

- Strategic visioning and planning
- Problem identification and root cause analysis
- Developing action steps towards improvement
- Creating and maintaining a culture of collaboration towards shared decision-making
- Supporting professional learning and improvement

Monitoring will take place throughout the year. We will monitor mastery of grade level benchmarks through the use of Interim Assessments, District Diagnostics: FSQ's USA, NGSQ's, Imagine Learning, FAST Progress Monitoring, iReady, 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, Science, Social Studies. Teachers are trained by the ESE Coordinator to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction, based on the results of data.

Professional Learning Communities occur formally every other week per content area. Content area teachers meet with administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and problem solve to adjust instruction if needed. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed during Leadership Team meetings, Professional Learning Communities, the Instructional Leadership Team meetings, Faculty meetings, and School Advisory Council meetings.

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.

We strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:

- Review of Lesson Plans,
- Data Analysis,
- Classroom walks,
- Student attendance,
- Data Chats,
- Formal Observations,
- Professional Learning Communities attendance/participation,
- Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology.

Teachers follow the scope and sequence as outlined on the Palm Beach County curriculum resource on

blender. This ensures that teachers have a concrete timeline as well as the resources to provide quality instruction on the mandated curriculum.

### Demographic Data

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 54%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 62%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | N/A  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: A<br>2019-20: B<br>2018-19: B<br>2017-18: B   |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |  |

### 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   | 35          | 19 | 24 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 18          | 11 | 31 | 27 | 4  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 13          | 10 | 12 | 22 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 24 | 15 | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 17 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 27 | 4  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45  |       |

**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 | 14          | 9 | 15 | 28 | 23 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106   |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 1 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21    |
| 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           | 26 | 25 | 16 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1  | 1  | 2  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8   |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 8  | 19 | 25 | 16 | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 5  | 4  | 8  | 9  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 10 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 12 | 25 | 27 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99  |       |

**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           | 4 | 12 | 9 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57    |

### The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |
| 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   | 0           | 26 | 25 | 16 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1  | 1  | 2  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8   |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 8  | 19 | 25 | 16 | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 5  | 4  | 8  | 9  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 10 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 12 | 25 | 27 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99  |       |

### 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           | 4 | 12 | 9 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57    |

### The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |
| 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    | 70     | 59       | 56    | 60     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 75     |          |       | 61     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 70     |          |       | 44     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 64     | 57       | 59    | 69     | 53       | 50    | 53     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 75     |          |       | 43     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 50     |          |       | 24     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 63     | 54       | 54    | 58     | 59       | 59    | 55     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 66       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 54       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 47       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    |        | 56       | 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           | 60  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 239 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 4   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index           |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)     | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 67  |

**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      | 467 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD                  | 34                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| ELL                  | 59                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                  |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                  |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                  | 61                                     |                           |  |  |
| HSP                  | 62                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                  |  |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  | 57                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 58                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD                  | 48                                     |                           |  |  |
| ELL                  | 58                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                  |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                  |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                  | 71                                     |                           |  |  |
| HSP                  | 66                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| MUL                  | 70                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  | 66                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 63                                     |                           |  |  |

**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**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students     | 60              |               |                    | 64               |                |                     | 63              |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| SWD              | 28              |               |                    | 40               |                |                     | 45              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |
| ELL              | 67              |               |                    | 50               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          | 2                              |                     |
| AMI              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| BLK              | 71              |               |                    | 58               |                |                     | 50              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |
| HSP              | 65              |               |                    | 68               |                |                     | 63              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |
| MUL              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| PAC              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| WHT              | 55              |               |                    | 62               |                |                     | 66              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |
| FRL              | 56              |               |                    | 58               |                |                     | 66              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |

**2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2020-21</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2020-21</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students     | 70              | 75            | 70                 | 69               | 75             | 50                  | 58              |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| SWD              | 39              | 63            | 46                 | 50               | 57             | 43                  | 38              |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ELL              | 58              |               |                    | 58               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| AMI              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |



| 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  | 76       | 76     |             | 63        | 69      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 74       | 77     | 75          | 65        | 75      | 43           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 70       |        |             | 70        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 68       | 76     | 69          | 71        | 75      | 47           | 53       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 63       | 70     | 71          | 60        | 75      | 52           | 53       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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                                   | 60       | 61     | 44          | 53        | 43      | 24           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 31       |        |             | 26        |         |              | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 66       | 70     |             | 31        | 10      |              | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 53       | 60     |             | 57        | 60      |              | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 57       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 62       | 58     |             | 57        | 45      |              | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 54       | 65     |             | 46        | 38      | 31           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

### 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 | 71%    | 56%      | 15%                        | 54%   | 17%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 65%    | 58%      | 7%                         | 58%   | 7%                      |

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 47%    | 48%      | -1%                        | 50%   | -3%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 59%    | 57%      | 2%                         | 59%   | 0%                      |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 51%    | 52%      | -1%                        | 61%   | -10%                    |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 77%    | 56%      | 21%                        | 55%   | 22%                     |

| 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.**

This year requires a unique lens while analyzing data, but to the change in assessment.

The results from the FAST assessment need to be considered when setting goals for this year. ELA proficiency dropped from 70% on FSA to 60% overall proficiency on PM 3 of FAST. Grade 5 maintained 71% proficiency, while grade 4 dropped from 70 to 65%. The largest concern comes from 3rd grade data which dropped from 70% to 47%. Factors in this data a considered to be the new testing format, foundational gaps from COVID, and declining attendance trends.

Math was also assessed with a new test, FSA becoming FAST. 5th grade Math increased from 65% to 77%. Considerations for this increase should take into account that this was the first year that 4th grade AMP was present in school and sat for the 5th grade assessment. That same consideration should be given when considering 4th grade scores, which decreased from 70% to 51%. 3rd grade Math also showed a slight decreased from 69% to 64%

Science proficiency continued to trend upward from 58 to 63%. While all of these scores were above state and district averages, when comparing like schools the data fell below the trends of those schools. Learning gains were not considered as part of the school grading components, however consideration must be taken for students who were proficient in ELA or Math based on SY22 FSA and are no longer proficient based on results from the SY23 FAST assessment.

When considering subgroups, Students with disabilities were 23% proficient in ELA and 35% proficiency for Math. Additionally ELL students came at 33% proficiency for Math.

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

Based on data review the largest concern comes from 3rd grade ELA proficiency which dropped from 70% to 47%. Factors in this data are considered to be the new testing format, foundational gaps from COVID, and declining attendance trends. Due to the pandemic, the students had limited direct teacher support. As we continued through the FY21 school year approximately 30-50% of our students were learning virtually through the entire school year at any given point, with several switching back and forth during the first half of the year. The remaining students were required to remain 6 feet apart from one another and their teacher throughout the year. As a result, small group instruction occurred in unfamiliar and limited ways compared to our typical approach to teaching and learning. This cohort of students is still demonstrating the foundational gaps from this.

Additionally, when comparing teachers within the grade level, two teachers would benefit from support in their pedagogy based on data from local and state assessments and from observations on walk-throughs. Further analysis shows that many third grade students lacked the basic phonological awareness that lays the foundation for reading proficiency. Additionally students would benefit from remediation in poetry.

**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.**

When reviewing data, only 3rd grade ELA fell below the state and district trend lines, with the difference between the school and district average (47% to 48%) 1% not being statistically significant. The difference between the state and the school was moderate (47% to 50%)

Factors in this data are considered to be the new testing format, foundational gaps from COVID, and declining attendance trends. Due to the pandemic, the students had limited direct teacher support. As we continued through the FY21 school year approximately 30-50% of our students were learning virtually through the entire school year at any given point, with several switching back and forth during the first half of the year. The remaining students were required to remain 6 feet apart from one another and their teacher throughout the year. As a result, small group instruction occurred in unfamiliar and limited ways compared to our typical approach to teaching and learning. This cohort of students is still demonstrating the foundational gaps from this.

Additionally, when comparing teachers within the grade level, two teachers would benefit from support in their pedagogy based on data from local and state assessments and from observations on walk-throughs.

Further analysis shows that many third grade students lacked the basic phonological awareness that lays the foundation for reading proficiency. Additionally students would benefit from remediation in poetry.

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

Our bi-weekly PLCs focused on the use of formative assessments, consistently monitoring student mastery of standards and in-person instruction allowed us to remediate and conduct small-groups based on student need. The teachers kept parents aware of student achievement through parent phone calls and conferences. All teachers held all students to high expectations.

We had a plan to targeting struggling students and adjusted the grouping of students depending on progress monitoring of needs. Additionally, small group prescriptive after-school tutoring target remediating the foundational gaps.

Finally, additional students were accelerated through the AMP program.

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

In reviewing data from the EWS, attendance continues to be an area of concern with 138 (30%) of all students missing 10% of the school days. This is up slightly from the prior year with 109 (24%) missing 10% of possible attendance days. Students with a pattern of non-attendance will be targeted through a mentor program, building positive relationships to inspire student attendance.

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.

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

For SY 2024 priorities at Acreage pines are increasing 3rd grade reading, continuing the upward trend for SSS science, and increasing overall reading achievement.

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 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.

To ensure progress toward student achievement within third grade ELA in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan, to increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade. Our third grade ELA proficiency had the greatest gap to be on target with the District's Strategic Plan of 75% proficiency in third grade reading, as well as the largest gap between state and district performance. If we strengthen our primary (K-2) reading curriculum and instruction, as well as provide high quality instruction and focused remediation in grade 3, the result would increase the number of proficient third graders in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By May 2024, proficiency by 3rd grade students will increase from 47% to 70% in ELA as measured by performance monitoring 3 of the FAST assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

PLCs will be held on a bi-weekly basis. During these meetings, current data for all students will be examined for progress. Small groups will be monitored and adjusted as necessary as well as appropriate interventions. Teachers will collaborate and share successful practice to support instruction across grade levels.

Other forms of monitoring we may use are the following:

Review of Lesson Plans, Classroom walks, Student work samples/portfolio/binder reviews, student attendance, student data chats, formal observations, Formative/Summative Assessments and teacher use of technology

The monitoring will be supported by key members of the leadership team: Assistant Principal and Instructional Coaches.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@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. Utilize instructional staff during ELA to support teachers implement a coherent curriculum that focuses on academic standards to ensure student learning and success.
2. Incorporate in school, pre-school, and/or after school tutorials to support standards based instruction for remediation, enrichment and support for selected students identified by data analysis to close the achievement gap.
3. Continue high quality Professional Learning Communities cycles within all grade levels focusing on the "how" of instruction. Ensure teachers are focused on best practices that support equitable & equal access to learning for all students all the time.
4. Differentiated small group instruction will be utilized in all ELA classrooms. Through differentiation we are ensuring we support all learners at their ability.
5. Students will engage in adaptive technology to offer personalized learning solutions that provide support/reteach/enrichment at their level (iReady).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Utilize instructional staff and tutors to support the implementation of the ELA curriculum. The materials and resources are designed to provide a coherent sequence of instruction.
2. Tutorials will provide students with the additional supports for remediation/enrichment as needed and will ensure students receive the additional support for success.
3. Professional Learning Communities teachers engaging in analysis of standards based teaching and learning that provides a high degree of accountability; provides teachers and teams with the opportunity to progress monitor the achievement of all students and make decisions on next steps based on thorough analysis of data.
4. Small group instruction provides an opportunity for teachers to personalize the learning and provide direct instruction to students at varying levels.
5. iReady will offer an opportunity for students to receive enrichment and remediation based on results from assessment and practice on a variety of skills.

#### **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. iReady learning
  - a. provide for PD for associated staff
  - b. provide time for practice via iReady during rotations in the instructional block
  - c. iReady reports will be used to monitor students' mastery of standards and usage of the program.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Dettling (megan.dettling@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** May 2024

2. Professional Development/PLC
  - a. PD/PLCs will focus on data analysis and effective instruction
  - b. Teachers will work collaboratively in PLCs to plan and develop lessons aligned to the BEST standards
  - c. iReady staff will work collaboratively with admin and teachers to deliver relevant PD

**Person Responsible:** Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** May 2023

3. Tutorial
  - a. Afterschool tutorial will be offered to students based on data analysis and a focused need for instruction
  - b. Tutors will use material provided by iReady/Benchmark, and resources available on Blender
  - c. data from PM 2 of the FAST assessment will be analyzed to provide targeted tutorial instruction

**Person Responsible:** Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** May 2023

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

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

Based on the data review of school assessments, the master schedule and teacher observation, it is evident that science achievement is an area that should be focused on in order to continue the positive trend and achieve proficiency comparable to like schools. Acreage Pines has been showing a positive trend the past 2 years science achievement. Based on state assessment data, science achievement for students with disabilities increased to 67, which reverses a 3 year trend of lower science achievement for this subgroup. Additionally, a review of the master schedule shows the need to provide additional time for science instruction, especially in grades 3 and 4 where the fair game standards are initially taught.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By May 2023, overall science achievement will increase from 63% to 68% based on the state NGSSS assessment for grade 5 students.

**Monitoring:**

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

Science data will be monitored using district FSQ's and USA's, District diagnostic tests. and the NGSS end of year assessment. Additionally, walkthroughs by school administration will be used for monitoring of implementation of science instruction and compliance with the master schedule. Data and instructional planning will take place during PLC times.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Incorporate Small group instruction during science instruction to support students learning at their ability with a variety of tasks, process, and product.
2. Use PENDA during tutoring programs to ensure learning supplemented with additional resources
3. Science teachers will incorporate the use of technology-based programs and labs enhance students' ability to integrate knowledge.
4. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies. PD will support the development of teacher expertise and instructional strategy success and focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Incorporate small group instruction utilizing USA and FSQ data to meet the students' need for standards based practice and to identify areas of weakness for targeted remediation. Both USA's and FSQ's have proven successful in preparing students for the NGSSS assessment.
2. Use of adaptive technology based programs, such as PENDA, is an effective tool that enable teachers to differentiate instruction based on a student's specific area of need.
4. PLC's and PD's allow teachers and leadership an opportunity to collaborate, to analyze data, and to make decisions to improve student achievement and progress.

**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. Penda learning
  - a. provide for PD for associated staff
  - b. provide time for practice via PENDA during the school day
  - c. provide time for practice via PENDA during the afterschool program
  - d. PENDA reports will be used to monitor students' mastery of standards and usage of the program.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Dettling (megan.dettling@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** May 2023

2. Professional Development/PLC
  - a. PD/PLCs will focus on data analysis and effective instruction
  - b. Teachers will work collaboratively in PLCs to plan and develop lessons aligned to the NGSSS standards
  - c. District science staff will work collaboratively with admin to deliver relevant science PD

**Person Responsible:** Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** May 2023

3. Tutorial
  - a. afterschool science tutorial will be offered to all 5th grade students
  - b. Tutors will use material provided by PENDA learning and on Blender
  - c. data from diagnostic will be analyzed to provide targeted tutorial instruction

**Person Responsible:** Megan Dettling (megan.dettling@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** May 2023



**#3. 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.

Many stakeholders take part in building the positive climate at Acreage Pines. Assistant Principal, Megan Dettling, oversees the school safety plan and implementation of PBS. The guidance team, Jenna Ohm and Jason Lee promote social-emotional wellness in a variety of ways including newsletters, instruction, and small groups. The SBT team is headed by Jennifer Ohm and attended by all administrators, Darline Karbowski and Megan Dettling, as well as the guidance team, and the ESE contact, Jennifer Bermudez. The ESE team provides academic and behavior support. The school principal, Darline Karbowski, facilitates community events, develops PD, teacher recognition, and special recognition for students. The entire front office staff creates a welcoming and inclusive environment, so that ALL stakeholders feel safe coming in to school to be part of their child's education. Teachers and the guidance team teach the required curriculum. Guidance and administration together collaborate on students in need of support, including any attendance concerns, the need for academic and behavior support and coordination of community resources.

Teachers incorporate SwPBS; a framework that brings together school communities to develop positive, safe, supportive learning cultures. SWPBS assists schools to improve social, emotional, behavioral and academic outcomes for children and young people. to ensure all students have equitable and equal opportunity to learn in a positive environment. Acreage Pines will focus on reducing minor behavior disruptions that detract from instructional time.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Minor behavior infractions as defined as level 1 behaviors in the code of conduct will be reduced by 33% during the 2023-2024 school year when compared to like infractions for the 2022-2023 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

Discipline data will be monitored through Class Dojo, school district forms, parent communication log and SIS data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Megan Dettling (megan.dettling@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.)

Class Dojo is used as Tier 1: Universal Prevention (All). Tier 1 supports serve as the foundation for behavior and academics. Reteaching of expected behaviors is used as Tier 2: Targeted Prevention (Some) support focuses on improving specific skill deficits students have. Students that need Tier 3: Intensive, Individualized Prevention (Few) support will be supported with small group intervention from the BHP or BIA, use of behavior tracking sheets, and referral to SBT.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When you implement PBIS well, students experience improved behavioral, social, emotional, and academic outcomes; schools and programs reduce their use of exclusionary discipline practices and improve their overall climate. ClassDojo was created to help the classroom teachers keep up with specific behaviors on each individual student, both positive and negative. The company reported that teachers using ClassDojo reported a 45% – 90% increases in positive behavior and a

50% – 85% decrease in incidents of negative behavior” Because the program can give minute-by-minute, day-by-day, week-by-week feedback, students are encouraged and motivated to do a better job. Additionally, behavior tracking sheets allow for this same tracking to be done at a personalized level, with related student rewards.

#### **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 be trained on major vs minor infractions with support from district behavior coaches.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Dettling (megan.dettling@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** Training and support will be ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

All teacher and parents will be on Class Dojo to communicate and track behaviors.

**Person Responsible:** Darline Karbowski (darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** This will be done by September 15, 2023 and new students will be added within the 1st seven school days of attendance.

School counseling department will provide training to teachers on strategies to deal with minor behavior.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Ohm (jennifer.ohm@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** All teachers will be trained by October 31, 2023.

Students with repetitive behaviors (defined as 3 or more), will be referred to School Based Team for appropriate supports and interventions.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** This process will be ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

### **Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

If we focus on Standards-based instruction to increase overall k-2 proficiency school-wide in ELA, then we will increase student proficiency in 3rd grade and ensure alignment to the District's Strategic Plan, Theme 1 Academic Excellence and Growth. Our instructional priority is to monitor student understanding and provide corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning. Our FY23 primary grades' iReady proficiency levels are as follows:

Kindergarten- 89% Proficient

First Grade- 79% Proficient

Second Grade- 63% Proficient

Students' overall reading comprehension proficiency is 66% For literature text and 65% for Nonfiction text.

When looking at FY23 FAST PM #1-#3, we see the following percentages are on track

STAR Early Lit

PM1

K: 66.7%

1st: 67%

PM2

K: 75%

1st: 67.1%

PM3

K: 64%

1st: 11.1%

STAR Reading

PM1

K: N/A

1st: N/A

2nd: 42.85%

PM2

K: N/A

1st: N/A  
2nd: 55%

PM3  
K: 66.7%  
1st: 80.8%  
2nd: 70.9%

### **Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA**

If we focus on Standards-based instruction to increase overall 3-5 proficiency school-wide in ELA, then we will increase student proficiency in all students to ensure alignment to the District's Strategic Plan, Theme 1 Academic Excellence and Growth. Our instructional priority is to monitor student understanding and provide corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

The data below demonstrates the achievement levels of all our tested grade levels in all content areas including our ESSA identified subgroups:

FY19  
ELA  
3 72.3%  
4 60.9%  
5 64.2%  
SWDs 75%  
Blacks 53.3%

FY22  
ELA  
3 69.7%  
4 70.4%  
5 69.9%  
SWDs 20%  
Blacks 72.7%

Our FAST Data shows the following percentages are level 3 or higher.

PM1  
3rd: 21.3%  
4th: 30.8%  
5th: 42.85%

PM2  
3rd: 33.3%  
4th: 50.52%  
5th: 55%

PM3  
3rd: 46.6%  
4th: 65.04%  
5th: 70.9%

## Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

February 2023

Kindergarten- 75% On Track

First Grade- 61.7% On Track

Second Grade- 61% On Track

May 2023

64.1% On Track

70% On Track

59.5% On Track

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd

47% Proficient - FAST Spring ELA assessment

Measurable goal for FY24: 70% of our 3rd grade students will demonstrate proficiency on our 2024 FAST ELA assessment. This outcome is based on prior year data. In FY19 and FY22 72% and 70% of 3rd graders respectively demonstrated proficiency on end of year statewide ELA assessments.

## Monitoring

### Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Third grade achievement is monitored regularly through grade-level data chats every trimester, biweekly grade-level PLCs, and monthly monitoring by admin during Instructional Leadership meetings. School-based team meets regularly to monitor students who receive academic interventions. Monitoring will occur throughout our PLC for each grade level. Each team will review iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring checks, Reading running records, and end of unit assessments from the Benchmark Series. We will also use grade level FSQ and USA to track growth within standards. We will also review of Lesson Plans, Data Analysis, Classroom walks, Student work samples/portfolio/binder reviews, Student attendance, Data Chats, Formal Observations, Professional Learning Communities attendance/ participation, all Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology. The school's behavioral health team meets regularly to address students with behavioral and counseling needs. Monitoring the grade-level's academic and behavioral progress allows for teachers and administration to best meet the academic needs of the students. Teachers work together with administration to develop student rosters for before- and after-school tutorial programs. Consistent progress monitoring of student data will positively impact student achievement by providing teachers and support staff to opportunities to

remediate if needed. Monitoring is a very important step towards student achievement and school improvement. It provides teachers and administration the data that they need to make decisions about instruction and differentiated support for the students.

### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dettling, Megan, [megan.dettling@palmbeachschools.org](mailto:megan.dettling@palmbeachschools.org)

## **Evidence-based Practices/Programs**

### **Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

1. Small group instruction: Teachers and well as supplemental support teachers will provide strategically, differentiated instructional support for all learnings. Intervention support will meet student's diverse needs through programs such as UFLI, Voyager, LLI, ect.

2. Professional Development: Teachers and support staff will attend ongoing professional development to engage deep, focused, collaborative planning to support and strengthen data analysis and small group planning and implementation. District support regularly conducts professional development, including representatives from iReady and district literacy specialists.

3. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers. collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies. PD will support the development of teacher expertise and instructional strategy success and focus.

### **Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

1. Incorporate small group instruction utilizing iReady subgroup needs assessment data to meet the students' need for foundational skill practice and to identify areas of weakness for targeted remediation. Weekly benchmark assessments will also be used to support growth within the standards. Small groups make it easy for teachers to give students the one-on-one attention they need, to observe their learning in action, and to provide constructive feedback. Students take personalized feedback and use it during whole class instruction and when doing homework, so the result is improved student outcomes.

2. Teachers will receive ongoing PD to help them plan, organize, and implements consistent and differentiated learning for all students. They will target remediation and enrichment within their planning and PD. It also fosters a positive and inclusive learning culture, where students feel valued, respected,

and motivated. By differentiating instruction and assessment, teachers can enhance the quality and effectiveness of your teaching and learning.

3. PLC's allow teachers and leadership an opportunity to collaborate, to analyze data, and to make decisions to improve student achievement and progress. It also supports teacher in collaboration with best teaching strategies. The process will allow teachers to match instructional resources to each student's education need(s). PLCs allow educators opportunities to directly improve teaching and learning. PLCs allow teachers an easy way to share best practices and brainstorm innovative ways to improve learning and drive student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring                                     |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Incorporate Small group instruction; focusing on four aspects of Literacy; writing, reading, speaking &amp; listening) (Professional Learning/ Literacy Coaching)</p> <p>a. Students will be assessed using FAST K-2 STAR, FAST 3-5 Cambium iReady, Benchmark Unit Assessments and FSQ's in Language Arts. Teacher will utilize Differentiated Instruction strategies and small group instruction (Assessment).</p> <p>b. Teachers will analyze student data to determine strengths and weaknesses in content area.</p> <p>c. Teachers will create all small group rotational cycles to ensure all students supported at their abilities</p> <p>d. Teachers will create lesson plans utilizing a variety of resources, instructional materials, and teaching methodologies to support all learners.</p> <p>e. Teachers follow District Assessment schedule of ongoing formative assessments to track student learning and adjust instruction continuously</p> <p>Grade-level PLCs will utilize the Continuous Improvement Model and monitor student progress on FAST assessments, USAs, ORRs, and teacher observations. Teachers will plan collaboratively on ways that students remediation and enrichment will be delivered. Portions of each PLC will focus on small group instruction and planning lessons that meet the needs of diverse learners while maintaining a high-level of rigor.</p> | <p>Karbowski, Darline,<br/>darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org</p> |
| <p>1. School admin and Literacy Leadership Teams attend training on the operational plan for collection and regular review of progress monitoring data to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction in Core (Tier 1) and to monitor progress of students receiving Supplemental (Tier 2) and Intensive (Tier 3) interventions.</p> <p>2. School leaders share the plan with staff in faculty meetings and PLCs.</p> <p>3. The principal monitors the implementation through walkthroughs, instructional rounds, PLCs, etc. to ensure the plan is implemented effectively.</p> <p>4. The Regional and Instructional Superintendents monitor the implementation, and the District Reading Collaboration team provides professional development.</p> <p>5. The Instructional and Regional Superintendents are responsible for ensuring that principals follow the School-level Reading Plan implementation and monitor progress.</p> <p>6. Regular (i.e., quarterly) data collection and review meetings will be scheduled between the District Reading Collaboration team and Regional/ Instructional Superintendents to determine individual school needs and provide additional training and support.</p> <p>7. The District Reading Collaboration team provides professional development to schools based on needs.</p>  | <p>Karbowski, Darline,<br/>darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org</p> |
| <p>Administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor and support reading instruction and intervention using Look Fors and CAO updates.</p> <p>Literacy Leadership Team meets regularly to ensure compliance with the reading plan.</p>   | <p>Karbowski, Darline,<br/>darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org</p> |



| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring                                     |
|--|---|
| <p>a. Development of a PLC schedule to include all content area teachers and resource teachers.</p> <p>b. The PLCs sessions will focus on data analysis and effective instruction based on the needs of students</p> <p>c. Instructional leadership team will develop and implement the coaching cycle to build teachers capacity with the gradual release model, small group instruction and differentiated instruction.</p> <p>d. Teachers will work collaboratively to plan and develop lessons focused on strategies aligned to the standards.</p> | <p>Karbowski, Darline,<br/>darline.karbowski@palmbeachschools.org</p> |