Golden Grove Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Golden Grove Elementary School

5959 140TH AVE N, West Palm Beach, FL 33411

https://gges.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.

As aligned to the SDPBC Mission, Golden Grove Elementary School is committed to providing a safe, positive, and culturally diverse environment that will provide each child with the opportunity to reach their fullest academic and social potential in a technology enriched setting

Provide the school's vision statement.

As aligned to the SDPC Vision, Golden Grove Community Elementary, united with parents and community, will guide our students to become responsible, respectful, literate and productive members of society, who will appreciate their past, enrich their present, and embrace their future.

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
Edgecomb, Linda	Principal	Instructional leader. Responsible for facilitating academic goal setting and ensuring students meet their learning objectives. Support Professional development of staff; ensure the safety of staff and students; recruit and retain highly effective teachers; establish and maintain a positive rapport with all stakeholders. Oversee the school's budget and day-to-day operations. Additional Responsibilities are listed: Supervision of all staff (instructional and non instructional) Monitor deliberate practice for all instructional staff Monitor all data (academic and discipline) Employee Building Council Marzano framework Overall school safety School/ Community Facilitator
Dye, Candace	Assistant Principal	Testing Coordinator, instructional resource manager, safety coordinator, administrator in charge of discipline, conducts teacher observation/ evaluations, instructional leader. Other responsibilities include, but are not limited to the following: Supervision of staff (instructional and non instructional) Monitor deliberate practice for instructional staff Monitor all data (academic and discipline) Marzano framework School safety School/ Community Facilitator
Blanar, Joy	Administrative Support	Responsible for carrying out specifically assigned tasks, provides secretarial and administrative responsibilities in the office, types confidential reports, and posts advertisement for school vacancies.
Ruddick, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Provide all students with rigorous conditions for learning; deliberate standards based, differentiated instruction to meet individual learning needs (remediation or enrichment); support students in mastering the essential curriculum.
Wesley, Tanya	Teacher, K-12	Provide all students with rigorous conditions for learning; deliberate standards based, differentiated instruction to meet individual learning needs (remediation or enrichment); support students in mastering the essential curriculum.
Didio, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Provide all students with rigorous conditions for learning; deliberate standards based, differentiated instruction to meet individual learning needs (remediation or enrichment); support students in mastering the essential curriculum.
Hopper, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Provide all students with rigorous conditions for learning; deliberate standards based, differentiated instruction to meet individual learning needs (remediation or enrichment); support students in mastering the essential curriculum.
Grunder, Sophia	Teacher, K-12	Provide all students with rigorous conditions for learning; deliberate standards based, differentiated instruction to meet individual learning

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		needs (remediation or enrichment); support students in mastering the essential curriculum.
Bleakley, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	Provide all students with rigorous conditions for learning; deliberate standards based, differentiated instruction to meet individual learning needs (remediation or enrichment); support students in mastering the essential curriculum.
Stanco, Sue	Teacher, ESE	Provide Students with Disabilities with rigorous conditions for learning; deliberate standards based, differentiated instruction to meet individual learning needs based on Individual Education Plan (support students in mastering the essential curriculum).
Besaw, Danielle	Behavior Specialist	Work collaboratively w/school counselor & psychologist; provide PD related to Behavior Mental Health; Provide group and individual sessions as needed beyond services provided by the school counselor; Provide families with resources; Check-in/out with students as needed based on team decisions; Crisis Response Team; Refer students to outside agencies as needed; Conduct Restorative Practices or Peer; Assist with Crisis Intervention services;Monitor and document services provided; Threat Assessment & Bullying Protocol

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.

Stakeholders were involved in the development of the School Improvement Plan (during Faculty Meeting and SAC meeting). Data analysis of ESSA groups drove the conversations. Discussed performance outcomes, strengths, opportunities for growth, and how to alleviate barriers that would positively impact student performanc. In particular on the FY23 F.A.S. T. ELA PM3, English Language Learners (ELL) and our Students with Disabilities (SWD) performed significantly below General Education students. Fifty-seven percent of ELL students scored below level and 46% of SWD scored below level. Twenty percent of Hispanics scored below grade level; 26% of Multi race students performed below level; 16% of Black students scored below grade level; 23% of White students scored below grade level and 28% of students receiving FRL scored below grade level. After taking a deep dive, stakeholders concluded that small group, intentional instruction to meet the differentiated needs of students was needed. The use of research based (vetted) resources would be needed; ensure that the interventions align to the academic deficit in an effort to provide the most effective instructions with desired student outcomes. Interventions to include, but not limited to i-Ready, Reading Plus, SPIRE, & LLI. In addition, acquire more human resources to create smaller instructional groupings; on-going purposeful monitoring, coach in; have students track their own progress as well as teachers conduct frequent student/teacher conferences. Communicate with parents and provide trainings regarding how to navigate the SIS platform; Reading & Math Family Nights equipping parents with resources and skills on how to best support child in reading

and math; Science night to provide hands on standards based science family activities to support grade level standards. On going Collaborative Planning on the Master Calendar weekly to dissect student samples; analyzing next instructional steps; Unpack standards for upcoming lessons; create relevant anchor charts, exit tickets, pre-determine possible barriers & devise a plan to eliminate such resulting in students progressing towards or meeting mastery of standards.

On the FY23 F.A.S.T. Math, 25% of students receiving FRL performed below grade level, 32% of our ELL students performed below grade level; 48% of our SWD students performed below grade level, 23% of our Black students performed below grade level; 26% of Multi race students performed below level; 18% of our Hispanic students performed below grade level; and 17% of our White students performed below grade level. Strategic, small group instruction will be used to address areas of deficit using i-Ready Math, Khan Math, and daily spiral reviews. Partner work & teacher conferences to progress monitor students & review student tracking of math progress. FY23 Fifth Grade Science results reflect 50% of Black students met mastery; 68% of Hispanics and 69% of White students met high standards. Forty-four percent of ELL students performed at or above grade level compared to 71% of non ELL students; 59% of SWD performed at or above grade level compared to 69% of non SWD students. 55% percent of students receiving FRL performed at or above grade level compared to 79% of non FRL 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))

SIP will be monitored regularly through evidence of content area weekly PLC meetings, monthly Academic Team Leaders meetings, monthly Faculty & SAC meetings, as well as weekly SBT meetings will be conducted with an additional focus on attendance. Core Leadership Team Meetings monitoring Grade level and school wide Wildly Important Goals. Academics on the agenda is a "Staple" of the culture at Golden Grove driving discussion and action steps for academic success. Formal observations will be conducted. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to examine effectiveness of Tier I instruction. In addition, during classroom walkthroughs, administration will look for evidence of PLC implementation; Explicit feedback will be provided reflecting best instructional practices and opportunities for growth. Professional Development will be provided as needed on or off site (observing a master teacher in the area of concern & provide opportunities for the developing teacher to teach a lesson and receive non evaluative feedback). Small group lesson plans and progress monitoring plans will be reviewed frequently. We will communicate with parents in multiple languages in an effort to build a stronger bridge between school and home. Teacher/Parent conferences, Teacher/Student data chats, as well as Teacher/Administration data chats will be conducted at minimum three times per year. All data points will be included in conferences to determine students' progress towards mastery of standards. These data points will include, but not limited to i-Ready Reading & Math, Reading Plus, PENDA Learning, F.A.S.T. PM 1, PM 2, PM 3, Top Score, & Khan Academy Math. Family Nights will support standards based learning and serve as an extension of academic practices at school that can carry over into the home. Aligned learning activities will be translated in multiple languages as well as our Community Language Facilitator will support families as needed. During the SIS / Gateway Training, parents will be taught how to navigate the platform progress monitoring student outcomes on various assessments throughout the year. During the Reading and Math Family Night, teachers will model a targeted skill at the various grade levels for students in reading and math using hands on activities/ academic games (make and take) that parents can use in the home. Parents will practice with other parents and then practice with students at home. The targeted skill will be reassessed after 4-6 weeks and teachers and parents will use the SIS Gateway to monitor progress. During the Family night for Science, Parents will experience an grade level science skills and concepts presented by Cox Museum (supported by Golden Grove science teachers) to help parents enhance science knowledge in skills using common items found in the home. The administration will examine instructional trends (best

practices as well as opportunities for growth) and create systemic learning walks using a particular lens of instruction in which to improve upon. Administration will continue to cultivate a Student-Centered learning environment and a culture of professional collaboration. Administrative Leadership team will conduct on-going conversations about the work, pivoting instructionally as needed for desired student outcomes on state academic standards.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	70%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	30	38	27	28	29	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	27	27	41	51	22	0	0	0	168
Course failure in Math	0	7	8	14	52	16	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	26	17	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	22	16	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	41	51	22	0	0	0	114

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	0	15	13	20	47	24	0	0	0	119

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	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	44	26	28	25	29	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	14	22	36	38	19	0	0	0	129
Course failure in Math	0	6	2	12	18	18	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	15	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	20	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	18	7	11	3	0	0	0	43

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	10	9	18	29	29	0	0	0	95

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	44	26	28	25	29	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	14	22	36	38	19	0	0	0	129
Course failure in Math	0	6	2	12	18	18	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	15	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	20	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	18	7	11	3	0	0	0	43

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	10	9	18	29	29	0	0	0	95

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	53	53	69	59	56	69		
ELA Learning Gains				68			83		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66			69		
Math Achievement*	63	57	59	72	53	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				74			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			54		
Science Achievement*	72	54	54	73	59	59	85		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	56	59	76			69		

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	324
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71

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	567
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	53			
HSP	67			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	55			

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	55			
ELL	72			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	59			
HSP	70			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	66			

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	61			63			72					69
SWD	29			29			56				5	77
ELL	57			64			75				5	69
AMI												
ASN	70			80							2	
BLK	55			45			52				4	
HSP	64			71			77				5	67
MUL	61			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	60			61			69				4	
FRL	50			53			60				5	68

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	69	68	66	72	74	69	73					76
SWD	40	54	62	45	63	59	50					64
ELL	63	76	81	67	73	67	73					76
AMI												
ASN	70			90								

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	61	62		61	63		50					
HSP	66	68	70	72	75	70	64					75
MUL	77			77								
PAC												
WHT	72	70	60	73	75	74	81					
FRL	63	62	56	68	72	61	75					74

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	69	83	69	63	55	54	85					69
SWD	40	92	90	37	69	70	46					62
ELL	46			63								69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	66	73		41	36		77					
HSP	66	80	70	64	51		90					69
MUL	100			75								
PAC												
WHT	71	85	75	67	63	54	83					
FRL	64	83	67	57	52	43	87					70

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	66%	56%	10%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	48%	9%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	54%	46%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	52%	13%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	56%	4%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	51%	17%	51%	17%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The Data Component that showed the lowest performance include ELL and SWD students as well as Black students on the FY23 F.A.S.T. ELA. Fifty-seven percent of our English Language Learners (ELL) students performed below grade level; 46% of our Students with Disabilities (SWD) performed below level; 16% of our Black students performed below level in ELA. In 2021 ELL achievement percent was 39% and in 2022 fifty one percent of ELL students performed on or above level. In regards to math, in 2021 58% of students demonstrated proficiency and in 2022 57% demonstrated high achievement in math. Sixty percent of 5th grade ELL students scored a Level 3 or higher on the state's science test. In 2021 and 2022 40% of SWD students demonstrated high achievement on the ELA portion of the state test and in 2021 37% demonstrated high achievement in math and in 2022, 45% demonstrated high achievement in math. In 2021 46% of Fifth grade SWD students scored a level 3 or higher on the state's science test. In 2022, 50% of SWD students scored a level 3 or higher. Some of the contributing factors impacting low performance for these subgroups include, but may not be limited to, targeted small group instruction, professional development, authentic student engagement during Tier 1 instruction. In addition, monitoring in real time to make instructional adjustments when needed & effective collaborative planning. Last but not least, more effective monitoring by administration via more frequent data chats.

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

The data component reflecting the greatest decline from the prior year is ELA for SWD and ELL students. More effective collaborative planning, more frequent monitoring of students' progress in real time; pivoting to meet the learning needs of students. The use of relevant data to be used for targeted, intentional small group instruction.. The analysis of data to ensure the intervention is aligned to the deficit resulting in desired student academic outcomes. Another important factor is the encouragement of family engagement to support academics. Including parents as partners to build a stronger bridge between school and home. Sharing with parents how to navigate the SIS Gateway in an effort to progress monitor child's academics. Communication between the teacher and parent regarding academics is key. Determining the parents preferred form of communication. Encouraging parents to participate in activities at school as well as attend parent trainings / family engagement where teachers and staff share standards and equip parents with aligned learning activities/academic games they could practice at home in Reading and Math. Professional Development in Best Practices identifying reading behaviors, strategies and next steps to support the student's progress in reading. The use of manipulatives and other strategies to help students with the real world connections to math in school and at home.

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.

Golden Grove out performed the state in every content area. The FY23 F.A.S.T. stare average in 3rd grade ELA was 50; Fifty seven percent of Golden Grove's third grade students demonstrated achievement. However, this was a decrease from FY22 where 68% of the third grade students demonstrated achievement. Some of the factors could be Tier 1 instruction and planning effectively for intentional small group instruction based on relevant data. Fourth Grade FY23 ELA was 66% which was above the state's average of 61%. Fifth Grade FY23 ELA was also 66%, again above the state's average of 55%. In math, third grade students demonstrated high achievement (66%); the state's average in math was 59%. However, in FY22 75% of students demonstrated high achievement in math. A focus to address the decline is effective collaborative planning and stronger Tier 1 instruction along with purposeful small group instruction. Fourth grade FY23 Math, 71% of students demonstrated high achievement. The state's average was 61%. Seventy-two percent of 4th graders demonstrated proficiency in FY22. The states FY23 Fifth grade math average was 55%; Golden Grove's average was 60%. However, the year prior (FY22), 70% of fifth grade students demonstrated proficiency on the state's math test. In Fifth grade FY23 science, the state's average was 51%; Golden Grove 68% compared to FY22 72%.The focus in content areas include effective collaborative planning, Intentional small group instruction, frequent monitoring/conferencing, frequent/effective communication between school/home, and an increase in parent engagement to support academics

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

Science data reflect the most consistent of all of the content areas over the past two years. Possible contributing factors include hands on experiments, connecting content to the real world, a combination of note taking and technology; spiral review of content, exclusive time and single subject taught; depth of knowledge, high expectations and strong tier 1 instruction. SWD and ELL students who tend to have challenges in reading, often do well in science due to the hands on opportunities to make those connections and applications to the real world. A double down approach providing additional human resources for small group instruction positively impacts desired student outcomes in science. Frequent monitoring, high engagement, high expectations and opportunities for student collaboration about the work keeps students authentically engaged in the learning process.

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

The area on the EWS data from Part I, the number of students absent 10% or more days is a tremendous concern. During the 2022-2023 school year 44 first graders, 26 second graders, 28 third graders, 25 fourth graders, and 29 fifth graders present concerns with attending school on a consistent

basis. The absences negatively impacts academic progress. In addition, the academic gap for students continues to widen.As a result student formative data will reflect holes in learning ultimately, this results in students not meeting his or her potential which could cause him or her to have a lack of confidence in his or her ability to learn or demonstrate application of knowledge. In addition, when students are frequently absent, many times it becomes a challenge for them to establish a routine of schooling. With the number of primary students with such high absenteeism rate, the foundational skills are not firmly acquired which often times causes students to perform below grade level. This impacts their confidence and love for learning.

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

The highest priorities include a focus on the following:

1. Professional Learning Communities
2. Collaborative Planning
3. Continued focus on identified ESSA subgroups
4. Improve third grade ELA proficiency
5. Increase Science Scores

Professional Learning Communities will convene weekly opposed to twice monthly with a collaborative culture driving standards-based planning, data analysis, forward thinking about possible barriers and a plan to alleviate such. Teachers will meet to plan standards--based, student-centered instruction resulting in desired student outcomes. The expectation is that evidence of the weekly PLCs should unfold in classroom delivery of standards-based instruction. There should be evidence of PLCs trending throughout grade/content area classrooms. Feedback will be provided during classroom walkthroughs and/observations. During collaborative planning, teachers will arrive with resources and agendas; Respect group norms (which were created collaboratively) and work as a team following the continuous improvement process. Through this work, trust will develop and teachers will own the work. The vulnerability will decrease and the team will begin to see themselves as one team opposed to individuals. This will create a sense of "We" opposed to "I." There will be a continuous focus on our identified ESSA groups. Additional human resources will support the double down model to create smaller, purposeful, and more precise groups to meet the diverse needs of all learners. The resource teachers will work and plan collaboratively with the general education teachers to determine the best course of action using relevant data for desired student outcomes. Improving third grade ELA scores in alignment with the SDPBC strategic plan is another priority. The goal is to increase the percentage at minimum by 5 points. This will be done in part by acquiring a certified academic tutor (who will work collaboratively with content area teachers) to provide small group intentional instruction aligned to identified intervention. This will increase the likelihood of students demonstrating progress and performing consistently towards, at, or beyond grade level on formative assessments. The final area of priority is improving the number of students who demonstrate high achievement in science. The purchase of PENDA Learning will support the standards-based instruction by providing high student engagement. Spiral review will provide science data to determine next instructional steps.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

SwPBS was identified as a need. In reviewing the Number of Incidents comparing FY22 to FY23 the data reflects the following: Repetitive Disobedience/Insubordination 2022 (8); 2023 (3). Inappropriate Activity 2022 (6); 2023 (4); Physical Aggression 2022 (1); 2023 (6); Disruptive Unruly Behavior 2022 (0); 2023 (2); Threat/Intimidation 2022 (0); Disobedience/Insubordination 2022 (4); 2023 (0); Bullying and Cyber bullying (1 each) in 2022 & 2023; Disruptive Behavior 2022 (0); 2023 (2); Petty Theft 2022 (0); 2023 (2); Repetitive Disruptive Behavior 2022(2); 2023 (0); Lying/Misrepresentation 2022 (1); 2023 (0); Severe Inappropriate Activity 2022 (1); 2023 (0); Unauthorized Materials 2022 (1); 2023 (0); Vape Tobacco 2022 (0); 2023 (1) 2023 (1) Three of the incident 2022 were by ELL students; in 2023 1 by an ELL student; 2022 (12) by SWD student; 2023 (1). We will focus on Positive Culture and Environment with a lens on decreasing physical aggression. In alignment to the District's Strategic Plan, we enhance a sense of belonging, safety, and acceptance for all students. 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.

Based on our Area of Focus, we will be able to measure the success of our work both at midyear and end of the year.

Student Desired Outcomes:
Our goal is to reduce the number of discipline referrals by 10% by December 2023 and by another 10% by the end of the year.

Teacher Desired Practice Outcomes:
By December 2023, 80% of our teachers will positively reinforce student behaviors.
By February 2024, 100% of our teachers will positively reinforce student behaviors.

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

We will monitor goals using the following:
Classroom observation
Observations of Class earns school wide incentive (Game Cart)
Scheduled pulling of Tutorial data (attendance)
Scheduled pulling of Attendance data
Scheduled pulling of Suspension data
Student Formative Assessment results
Share student discipline data at our monthly Core Leadership, faculty, & PBIS meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Candace Dye (candace.dye@palmbeachschools.org)

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

The evidence-based interventions we will use to see the improvements for our Area of Focus include the following:

1. Character Development via School Counselor on the Fine Arts Wheel
2. Schoolwide Discipline Plan
3. Schoolwide Attendance Plan
4. SWPBS
5. Parent Involvement
6. Required Instruction Florida State Statute 1003.42 and Policy 2.09

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

The evidence-based interventions we will use to see the improvements for our Area of Focus include the following;

1. Schoolwide Discipline Plan: A systematic approach to discipline enhances learning outcomes for all students. By reinforcing desired behavioral outcomes students will clearly understand expectations. Expectations are modeled and students are explicitly taught what the desired behavior should be.
2. Schoolwide Attendance Plan: The attendance rate is important because students are more likely to succeed in academics when they attend school consistently. It's difficult for the teacher and the class to build their skills and progress if a large number of students are frequently absent. An attendance plan will ensure all stakeholders understand the expectations and can collaborate to support all students to be in school on time and ready to learn.
3. SWPBS: supports the decrease of levels of disruptiveness, rates of office referrals, and suspensions. To improve school climate, safety, and order. To increase instructional time.
4. Parent Involvement/engagement in schools improve student attendance, social skills, and behavior. It helps children to become acclimated to the school culture and climate.
5. Required Instruction 1003.42 and Policy 2.09: A positive school culture and environment reflects a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity.

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.

SWPBS
Provide teachers with professional development to understand SWPBS
Ensure all expectations are clearly explained and understood
Establish a peer support system of new and returning teachers to ensure proper mentoring and coaching.
Schoolpostings of the SWPBS expectations in all common areas and in classrooms.
Monitor executions and implementation with fidelity.

Cafeteria assemblies are conducted to review expectations

Teachers reinforce expected behaviors in and out of the class through positive rewards

Trimester celebrations are held

Policy 2.09 and Required Instruction Florida State Statute 1003.42

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

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

Person Responsible: Danielle Besaw (danielle.besaw@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: By December 2023

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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

The lowest performance include ELL and SWD students as well as Black students on the FY23 F.A.S.T. ELA. Fifty-seven percent of our English Language Learners (ELL) students performed below grade level; 46% of our Students with Disabilities (SWD) performed below level; 16% of our Black students performed below level in ELA. In 2021 ELL achievement percent was 39% and in 2022 fifty one percent of ELL students performed on or above level. In regards to math, in 2021 58% of students demonstrated proficiency and in 2022 57% demonstrated high achievement in math. Sixty percent of 5th grade ELL students scored a Level 3 or higher on the state's science test. In 2021 and 2022 40% of SWD students demonstrated high achievement on the ELA portion of the state test and in 2021 37% demonstrated high achievement in math and in 2022, 45% demonstrated high achievement in math. In 2021 46% of Fifth grade SWD students scored a level 3 or higher on the state's science test. In 2022, 50% of SWD students scored a level 3 or higher.

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

75% of SWD, ELL, & Black students will demonstrate meeting threshold or higher on formative assessments
80% SWD, ELL, & Black students should meet Stretch Growth Goal in i-Ready by end of year (May 2024)
90% SWD, ELL, & Black students will demonstrate progress on F.A.S. T. ELA & Math from PM 1 to PM 2; PM 2 to PM 3

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

On-going Monitoring of small group instruction ensuring the intervention is aligned to the deficit.
On-going monitoring of various data points to include the following:
i-Ready
Reading Plus
Progress Monitoring I, 2, & 3
Teacher / student data chats
Parent/Teacher conferences

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Edgecomb (linda.edgecomb@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.)

Resource teacher schedules and Small group instruction lesson plans (collected monthly)
Resource teachers progress monitoring plans of individual students in groups
Use of i-Ready Interventions
LLI when appropriate
SPIRE when appropriate

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

Small group instruction affords the teacher and students a smaller teacher to student ratio. Teachers can establish rapport, honing in on specific areas of need using relevant data and researched based resources

to implement interventions on an individual or small group basis with the goal of closing the academic gaps of our identified subgroups.

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.

Resource teachers will meet weekly in PLCs to analyze student data and work collaboratively to determine next instructional steps. Create aligned exit tickets to upcoming standards; select aligned resources and learning activities to include a differentiated instruction even among small group participants to meet individual learning needs.

Person Responsible: Linda Edgecomb (linda.edgecomb@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Ongoing with check points each trimester (November 2023, February 2024 and May 2024