William T. Dwyer High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

William T. Dwyer High School

13601 N MILITARY TRL, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410

https://wtdh.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.

The staff of William T. Dwyer High School is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The staff of William T. Dwyer High School 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
Brooks, Corey	Principal	Provides leadership to ensure all academic standards are met. Ensures that academic policies and curriculum are followed. Facilitates collegiality and team building among staff members to maximize participation in the decision making process. Reviews academic and discipline data on a regular basis to develop plans of action with administrative team. Responsible for financial operations, personnel, public relations, and school policy regarding discipline. Meets with parents and other school stakeholders on a regular basis to develop school needs and action steps.
Farrell, Shannon	Assistant Principal	Supervises ELA, ELL and Guidance Departments. AICE/IB/AVID Contact. Ms. Farrell will be responsible for the monitoring of our ELA/ Reading Team PLC's. She will also be responsible for monitoring our low 25 student progress in ELA as well as aligning professional development for our teachers in ELA. Ms. Farrell will also monitor our school wide AVID strategy implementation.
Smith, Michael	Assistant Principal	Supervises World Language and ESE Departments. Mr. Smith also supervises Facilities, Custodial, Cafeteria, Leases and Facility Usage Supervisor. Mr. Smith will track our ESE students to ensure they make learning gains in FSA, EOC, and FSAA assessments.
Wilkes, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	Supervises Social Studies and PE . She also supervises school wide activities, recognition, and Awards (Staff and Students). She is also in charge of our athletics and school activities. Ms. Wilkes will responsible for monitoring the progress of our SwPBS. She will also ensure that data driven instruction and differentiation is taking place in U.S. World History.
Winfrey, Brenda		Supervises Physical Education, and ESE. Ms. Winfrey is our SwPBS coordinator and will responsible for monitoring it within our SIP. Ms. Winfrey is also the Single School Culture Coordinator. She will be responsible for monitoring SwPBS. Ms. Winfrey will also be responsible for monitoring our ESE students that fall into the Low 25 in both Math and ELA.
Wojciechowsky, Paul	Assistant Principal	Supervises Science, Reading and Math. He also is responsible for Data Analysis and Academic RTI. Responsible for monitoring student growth and ensuring teachers have the proper data to analyze their students. He is also the graduation gatekeeper and responsible for monitoring student acceleration. Responsible for ensuring differentiated instruction is taking place in Geometry and Algebra classrooms. Teachers will be utilizing the IXL program in math to support individualized instruction and monitors the usage and data feedback the program provides.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Samartino, Krisitin	ELL Compliance Specialist	(teacher)-is our ELL and AVID coordinator. Ms. Samartino will be responsible for tracking our ELL students. She also provides professional development to our teachers in implementing our AVID WICOR strategies.
Zuccaro, Joan	Teacher, ESE	(teacher)-is our ESE coordinator. Ms. Huff is responsible for implementing and monitoring the RTI process for academics and behavior.
Schneider, Deanna	School Counselor	Supervises acceleration for AICE, AP, and IB. Supports teachers regarding training/professional development, classroom best practices, and instructional support. Responsible for monitoring enrollment and retention in accelerated programs. Works with Choice Coordinator for IB program. Coordinates student course registration process, including course selection and course progression. Aids with the Masterboard. Track and coordinate AICE diploma program.
Vought, Wendy	Other	Organizes and plans testing in all capacities for every grade level. Provides updates on testing goals to meet objectives of the School Improvement Plan. Collaborates with the testing committee to improve the testing environment. Tracks participation and monitors testing progress throughout the school year. Trains faculty and staff how to appropriately and efficiently administer and/or proctor standardized assessments. Identifies at-risk Seniors missing graduation requirements and works closely with the Senior Assistant Principal to get students on track to graduate.
Breault, Neil	Math Coach	The math coach will provide support with the coaching continuum to model high yield strategies aligned to the BEST standards. He will lead PLC's to support the planning process, develop aligned assessments, and disaggregate data from NGSQ's and USA assessments. The math coach will also tutor students in need of intervention and target many of the lowest 25% quartile to ensure our most at risk students are making the gains they need to be successful.

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.

School leadership team will review last year's prior trend and individual student data to make informed decisions for adjustments and interventions to be provided this year within their respective subject or department areas. The school leadership team consists of department heads, ESE coordinator, ESOL coordinator, school counselors, behavior health professionals and the math coach. The administrative

team will meet with teachers and have one on one data chats to get their feedback on next steps and develop action plans. Our team has also developed committees for different initiatives on campus that will consist of teachers and students. Some of the committees are SWPBS, testing, social hospitality committee, and athletics committee. Within some of the committees we also include parents and business stakeholders to support, provide feedback and make recommendations. Feedback will also be garnered at our SIP meetings that include school admin, teachers, staff, parents, business partners and students.

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

The SIP is a living continuous document that will be updated throughout the year. Within the SIP their are multiple action steps that include reviewing data from specific sources and as a result continuing with the current plan devised or making adjustments for improvements. When data is analyzed we will do our best to work collaboratively with all parties involved to make the best decisions for student gains. We will also develop a multitude of tracking systems for our students with the greatest achievement gaps; low 25, ESE, and ELL students. When we review data we will be looking at root causes and make decisions that will impact the school as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Monitoring data will take place during leadership meetings, PLC's, and committee meetings. We will utilize assessments such as Reading Plus insight assessment, FSQ's, USA's, NGSQ's, semester exams, FAST progress monitoring, Florida Standard Assessments (retakes), EOC's and teacher assessments.

Some of our ELL students will also be monitored through the WIDA assessment program and a portion of our ESE students will be monitored through the FSAA assessment program.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	62%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)

	Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.*	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	50	52	50	55	55	51	59		
ELA Learning Gains				55			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			26		
Math Achievement*	34	38	38	37	42	38	36		
Math Learning Gains				45			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			23		
Science Achievement*	55	68	64	61	43	40	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	67	66	73	53	48	60		
Middle School Acceleration					46	44			
Graduation Rate	97	90	89	98	65	61	92		
College and Career Acceleration	66	71	65	69	69	67	71		
ELP Progress	55	40	45	37			33		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	614
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	98

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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	58			

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%
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	46			

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	38	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	43			
HSP	53			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	48			

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	50			34			55	60		97	66	55
SWD	27			11			23	37		24	6	
ELL	17			20			31	43		53	7	55
AMI												
ASN	76			77			86	78		96	6	

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
BLK	27			13			26	34		36	6	
HSP	40			34			47	64		77	7	53
MUL	32			23			42	61			4	
PAC												
WHT	64			50			76	73		77	7	55
FRL	31			21			35	42		45	7	55

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	55	55	42	37	45	42	61	73		98	69	37
SWD	27	43	40	18	29	44	45	39		96	16	
ELL	15	45	44	12	30	33	30	33		95	40	37
AMI												
ASN	69	66		50	47		71	91		100	77	
BLK	30	44	38	19	37	40	38	41		99	43	
HSP	54	53	42	36	44	27	59	73		99	68	25
MUL	71	67		44	55		76	82		97	76	
PAC												
WHT	66	60	50	49	49	50	74	84		98	79	
FRL	40	48	40	24	39	40	47	58		98	56	41

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	59	47	26	36	21	23	60	60		92	71	33
SWD	29	36	20	12	25	34	26	23		84	27	
ELL	25	47	50	15	15	15	50	15		83	48	33
AMI												
ASN	76	61		67	35		70	91		88	87	
BLK	32	33	17	7	15	20	32	31		88	43	
HSP	61	48	36	42	20	14	68	66		88	62	30
MUL	70	42		38	17		70			92	83	

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
PAC												
WHT	70	53	34	53	26	34	74	74		95	85	
FRL	45	41	22	21	19	23	45	43		86	54	33

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
10	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	50%	-4%
09	2023 - Spring	51%	48%	3%	48%	3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	48%	-27%	50%	-29%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	48%	-2%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	63%	-8%	63%	-8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	62%	-1%	63%	-2%

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.

Out Math proficiency showed the lowest performance at 36%. When we break down our data in math our Algebra proficiency was only 21%, while our Geometry proficiency was 47%. Contributing factors include lack of an in depth understanding of the new BEST standards by both our Algebra Geometry teachers. This was the first year utilizing the standards and one trend that administration observed while doing classroom observations was lack of real world connections with many of the standards and the lack of students having practice on EOC like problems with high levels of rigor. Some of the teacher feedback as to why there was a lack of high rigor EOC-like questions is that the students struggle with many of the foundational skills needed to be successful on the upper level questions. Teachers also reported not having instructional resource that could be consistently used as many of the questions were too rigorous with not enough building block material needed for students lacking many of the foundational skills needed. As a department teachers also have opportunity for growth with having students interact and apply the material at a more consistent basis. Setting up small student accountability groups would lead to more student feedback and data the teachers can use to improve adjustments that need to be made on the spot during instruction. For our AICE exams we had the lowest performances in our AICE literature with a 23% passing rate. This class also showed to be our greatest drop out of all of our AICE classes from a 43% to a 23%. One of our two teachers was a first-year teacher for this course. With both teachers we need support them by to continuing to provide professional development specifically related to the course content. 2023 was the first year that AICE Cambridge graded to the same standard as 2019 (pre-Covid).

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

Our US History proficiency showed the greatest decline from the previous year as we dropped from 73% to 61%, a drop of 12%. When we analyzed our data we observed that only 11% of our level 1 reading students were able to hit the proficient mark. 50% of our level 2 students and 88% of our proficient students were able to become proficient. Both were drops from each category compared to the previous year of 13% (level 1), 52% (level 2), and 93% (levels 3-5). One factor that contributed to this decline was the lack of consistency in delivering the FSQ and USA assessments to all students. As a result the review/reteach method was not used consistently in the department and students were not able to use the aligned EOC questions as a learning tool as much as they could have. Our teachers also have opportunity for growth in utilizing marking up the text strategies when they are teaching and/or reviewing/reteaching information as many of the US History questions involve being able to break down long reading passages with upper level vocabulary. For our AICE exams we had the lowest performances in our AICE literature with a 23% passing rate. This class also showed to be our greatest drop out of all of

our AICE classes from a 43% to a 23%. One of our 2 teachers was a first-year teacher for this course. With both teachers we need support them by to continuing to provide professional development specifically related to the course content. 2023 was the first year that AICE Cambridge graded to the same standard as 2019 (pre-Covid).

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.

Out Math proficiency showed the greatest gap in performance with the state average. Our overall math proficiency was 36% while the state average was 52%. When we break down our data in math our Algebra proficiency was only 21%, while our Geometry proficiency was 47%. Contributing factors include lack of an in depth understanding of the new BEST standards by both our Algebra Geometry teachers. This was the first year utilizing the standards and one trend that administration observed while doing classroom observations was lack of real world connections with many of the standards and the lack of students having practice on EOC like problems with high levels of rigor. Some of the teacher feedback as to why there was a lack of high rigor EOC-like questions is that the students struggle with many of the foundational skills needed to be successful on the upper level questions. Teachers also reported not having instructional resource that could be consistently used as many of the questions were too rigorous with not enough building block material needed for students lacking many of the foundational skills needed. As a department teachers also have opportunity for growth with having students interact and apply the material at a more consistent basis. Setting up small student accountability groups would lead to more student feedback and data the teachers can use to improve adjustments that need to be made on the spot during instruction.

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

Our school showed the greatest improvement in math low 25% gains. Although, this was not an official computation from the state this year, we were still able to compute them based upon the scale scores remaining the same from last year's test to this one. Our low 25 gains improved from FY22 (42%) to FY23 (51%). This was largely due in part to our Geometry low 25 gains, which were 56%. Our geometry teachers did a good job identifying the low 25 students in their class and providing them with differentiated interventions, as well as using programs such as IXL to differentiate specific foundational skills they needed support in. Our math teachers (Algebra and Geometry) held bi-weekly PLC's to review best practices for upcoming units and also reviewed data from USA's and FSQ's to determine high return on investment standards to infuse throughout the units. IXL was also utilized as a tool to remediate and build basic math skills. Administration also changed some of the teachers that instruct in Geometry which let to some better results with our overall gains and low 25 students. Our greatest improvements for our AICE exams was demonstrated in General Papers, Digital Media and Design, and Thinking Skills. General Papers improved from 57% to 72%, Digital Media and Design improved from 72% to 88%, and Thinking Skills improved from 71% to 87%. Our actions consisted of focusing on the continuous growth model with our teachers by continuous professional development and allowing teachers to plan together in planned learning community.

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

One potential area of concern is the level of failures that we have in our math classes. Last year we had 526 students receive at least an F in their math class.

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.

1) Providing all of our accountability teachers continuous training in the following:
ELA BEST standards
ELA BEST Writing Rubric
ELA BEST Math: Geometry and Algebra
AICE, AP, and IB training in each teacher's respective course area.
We would like to have training provided by outside specialist as well as team leads and math coach within the department.

2) Continuous PLC's that are data driven based upon assessment results (USA's and NGSQ's). PLC's will include our ESE facilitated support teachers as much as possible as our ESE students are one of our ESSA identified subgroup and we are looking for more cohesion within the push in support model with our content area teacher and our support teacher.

3) Supporting students that are not making gains on their PM assessments throughout the year. Identifying those students and providing targeted interventions based upon their data.

4) Supporting Literacy throughout the content areas by including current event articles from sites such as Newsela to practice marking up the text and comprehension skills in the subject areas of social studies and science.

5) Conduct data chats with teachers to review previous year's data, review and plan for their current student load, and goal set with accompanying methods and strategies to meet those goals.

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 Early Warning System

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

We had a total of 207 students with at least 1 suspension from school. We would like to decrease this number by 10%. It is important for us to decrease our overall suspensions as students lose instructional time and become further disengaged. Many of our suspensions are related to students to being disengaged with their academics. In alignment to the District's Strategic Plan, we enhance a sense of belonging, safety, and acceptance for all students. We will look at trends in behavior incidences from last year as well develop and implement a robust school wide positive behavior system to reinforce behaviors that are conducive to learning.
Our instructional priority is to use trends in student data to identify needs in order to support positive behaviors.

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

We would like to decrease our overall students with at least one suspension 10% from 207 to 196 or lower.

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

We will conduct biweekly meetings to review overall data trends with suspensions and apply to the appropriate interventions to support student behavior. Our goal will be to decrease at least by 10% the end of the first semester in December. We will pull discipline reports from EDW bi-weekly in order to monitor our school's progress with discipline. We will look at all infractions including level 1, as level 1 infractions may sometimes lead to major infractions that lead to a student being suspended.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@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.)

Setting up CHAMPS training for new teachers and teachers based upon data review of administrative classroom discipline checks, referrals written, and administrative classroom walkthroughs. We will also implement a school wide positive behavior plan that will highlight "Panthers of the Week" based upon recommendations from staff members. Effective communication with students and parents that will include weekly call outs from principal, a newsletter, as well as the principal communicating to the students regarding expectations daily on the morning announcements.

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

1) CHAMPS is a classroom management program that aims to improve student behavior plus strengthen learner engagement through a strategic system of clearly defined expectations.
2) SWPBS supports the decrease of levels of disruptiveness, rates of office referrals, and suspensions. To improve school climate, safety, and order. The ultimate goal is to increase quality instructional time with teacher and student.
3) Newsletter and various means of communication through phone, email, and social media improves parent involvement. Parent involvement in turn will lead to better student attendance and support of the school's policies and procedures.

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.

Provide teachers with professional development in CHAMPS from the district specialists.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 9/1/23

Pair new teachers with qualified mentor teachers to support them with classroom management and our school's policies and procedures.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 9/15/23

Send out weekly callouts to parents regarding school events and updates as well as reinforcing school behavior expectations.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 8/21/23

Send out weekly newsletter to parents regarding school events and updates, as well as reinforcing school behavior expectations.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 8/21/23

Pull bi-weekly discipline reports from EDW to be reviewed with staff and administration. Monitor data and make and necessary adjustments.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 9/15/23

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

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

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 3/14/23

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.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 3/14/23

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

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 3/14/23

Ongoing student recognition through our "Panther of the Week" program.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 9/15/23

Honor Roll Ice cream socials will be held at the end of every quarter.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 9/15/23

Semester grade level assemblies will be held to review student expectations with academics and behavior at the start of each semester.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 8/21/23

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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.

As a school in all accountability areas we did not show any improvement in any of the proficiency cells. We dropped 6% in ELA, 1% in Math, 12% in ELA, and 6% in Biology. As a school we feel that a root cause for the aforementioned drops are the proper training and collaboration needed to align instruction to the new BEST standards. Our ESE subgroup population has consistently fell below the 41% ESSA index over the years and in order to improve upon this accountability cell we will need proper planning in the core content areas as well as collaboration from the facilitative support teachers.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Based Outcomes:
We would like to improve proficiency and learning gains for all of our tested areas. Our goal for our ELA/Math proficiency is 60% proficiency. We would like to see both of our Math/ELA learning gains and low 25 learning gains reach at least 60%. Our goals for both US History and Biology is increase proficiency to the level of 70%. Our goal for our ESSA index for ESE students is improve to a 43% index.
Teacher Based Outcomes:

Monitoring:

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

1) Administration attendance and support at PLC's.
2) PLC notes and next steps sent out to team with deliverable action steps.
3) Administrative Classroom Walkthrough Data and Feedback. Teachers will receive feedback from i-observation, email, face-to-face conversations, and scheduled teacher-admin data chats.
4) Assessments: USA's, FSQ's, PBPA's, and PM1/PM2 assessments will be analyzed by overall teacher, school and district comparisons. Student Item Analysis will be analyzed to see what standards are needing remediation.
5) USA's, FSQ's and PBPA's and PM1/PM2 reports will be disaggregated by ESSA subgroups to monitor progress in each category.
6) Reading Plus Data will be pulled weekly to monitor overall C-readers per week student completion.
7) IXL data reports. Administration will review IXL reports bi-monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@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) All accountability and support teachers will meet to discuss high yield strategies. Discussions will take place on how they both (ELA/Reading) can capitalize by delivering instruction that is data driven and in alignment with FSA standards, while being in sync with each other. Analyzing BEST standards and aligning question stems to the rigor of the standard. Trainings will be implemented through our PLC's.
2) Admin/Teacher Data Chats: Administration will conduct data chats with respective department teachers throughout the year.

3) Teacher/Student Data Chats: Teachers will conduct data chats with their students periodically throughout the year.

4) Differentiation of Instruction within all classrooms. Supporting students with interventions that are not making gains on their PM1 and PM2.

5) Administration reviewing previous year teacher data and determining the appropriate positions for teachers that will yield the greatest improvement of student achievement.

6) School wide marking up the text literacy strategies and WICOR strategies implemented in content area courses.

7) Scaffolding: Scaffold in prior knowledge targeted skills to help build student confidence.

8) Teaching High Priority Standards: Focus on standards that will be prerequisites for future learning in the course. Standards that are not prerequisites will not be focused on with the same level of intensity.

9) Progress Monitoring: Consistently monitoring students to see where student weaknesses are and then being able to address any essential missed learning.

10) ESE and ELL strategies will be infused into professional development to ensure teachers have the proper instructional tools to support our students.

11) Supporting Literacy throughout the content areas by including current event articles from sites such as Newsela to practice marking up the text and comprehension skills in the subject areas of social studies and science.

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

1) When teachers implement high yield strategies within their content area such as Kagen structures during lessons they are able to monitor and hold a greater number of students accountable for their knowledge in a shorter period of time. One of the greatest challenges for teachers at our school is to be able to keep pace with the curriculum while meeting the students needs with major gaps in their learning. Analyzing BEST standards will also teachers to best determine the content and learning strategies to focus in on in order to be as efficient as possible.

2) When teachers, administrators, and students focus/monitor and set goals based upon previous data, research shows a greater improvement in academic outcomes.

3) Teachers and support ESE/ELL teachers that plan together are more likely to provide targeted content and interventions during instructinoal time. This is key in delivering small group instruction and providing the needed interventions.

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.

Administrative Classroom Walkthrough Data and Feedback. Teachers will receive feedback from i-observation, email, face-to-face conversations, and scheduled teacheradmin data chats.

Person Responsible: Paul Wojciechowsky (paul.wojciechowsky@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 10/1/23

Assessments: USA's, FSQ's, PBPA's, and FAST assessments will be analyzed by overall teacher, school and district comparisons during PLC's. Student Item Analysis will be analyzed to see what standards are needing remediation.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 10/1/23

A master calendar of Assessments will be created for administration to support monitoring data and goals.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 10/1/23

A master PLC calendar will be created and teachers will receive invites on their google calendar.

Person Responsible: Corey Brooks (corey.brooks@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: 9/1/23

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).

SDPBC requires every school regardless of school grade, to complete a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) aligned to the district's 5-Year Strategic Plan in the Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS) portal. Schools identified for Comprehensive Support & Improvement (CS&I), Targeted Support & Improvement (TS&I), and Additional Targeted Support & Improvement (ATSI) are provided personalized, one-on-one or small group support to assist the principal and leadership teams in developing comprehensive plans of action steps in the SIP for improving student achievement. These sessions ensure SIP and Strategic Plan alignment, provide an overview of the requirements of the School Board
and school improvement updates. The training is mandatory for all principals. Principals select members of their SIP leadership teams to attend a session with them. Working in collaboration with the school leadership team, the Regional Superintendent's Office, Performance Accountability/School Improvement, School Transformation and Federal/State Programs, the District ensures that the SIP, the Schoolwide Title I Plan, and other grant funded plans or allocations are in alignment with the District's Five-Year Strategic Plan and complementary in the funded strategies and supports for each school's continuous improvement. All plans are carefully reviewed and approved by the School Advisory Council (SAC), the Reginal Office team, and the Office of School Improvement.

Resources and allocations are focused on:
1) Resource teachers and (ESOL and ESE) support during small group instruction.
2) Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies.
3) Math Coach will provide teachers with a variety of levels of support to ensure teacher development and growth.
4) Curriculum resources to enhance ELA, Science, Math skills and support student
mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. standards, will support literacy across the content areas, will support social emotion growth through the resources found in the Skills for Learning & Life (SLL) Resource Center to promote character education.
5) Math and Literacy intervention programs such as IXL.