

The School District of Palm Beach County

Binks Forest Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Binks Forest Elementary School

15101 BENT CREEK RD, Wellington, FL 33414

<https://bkfe.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.

Binks Forest Elementary prepares students with higher-order thinking skills, responsible decision-making, and problem-solving skills necessary to perform on or above grade level. Our school will foster respect for diversity, and the character traits necessary to succeed in elementary school and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school community of Binks Forest Elementary will educate young minds for the challenges of tomorrow.

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
Levy, Michella	Principal	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing Rti, ensure implementation of the intervention support and documentation, and ensure adequate development to support Rti implementation. Attends PLCs to provide input and to serve as the education leader, ensuring the state standards are taught with fidelity.
Berard, Karen	Assistant Principal	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing Rti, ensure implementation of the intervention support and documentation, and ensure adequate development to support Rti implementation. Attends PLCs to provide input and to serve as the education leader, ensuring the state standards are taught with fidelity.
Hessler, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Teach state standards to students, participate in student data collection of the state standards' mastery, remediates and enriches to provide differentiation to all students, support students in attaining their personal best in academics, and communicate with ESE and ELL teachers as needed. Communicate with parents regarding the progress of their students.
Cheatham, Missy	Teacher, K-12	Teach state standards to students, participate in student data collection of the state standards' mastery, remediates and enriches to provide differentiation to all students, support students in attaining their personal best in academics, and communicate with ESE and ELL teachers as needed. Communicate with parents regarding the progress of their students.
Chapman, Kristyn	Teacher, K-12	Teach state standards to students, participate in student data collection of the state standards' mastery, remediates and enriches to provide differentiation to all students, support students in attaining their personal best in academics, and communicate with ESE and ELL teachers as needed. Communicate with parents regarding the progress of their students.
Benevides, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Teach state standards to students, participate in student data collection of the state standards' mastery, remediates and enriches to provide differentiation to all students, support students in attaining their personal best in academics, and communicate with ESE and ELL teachers as needed. Communicate with parents regarding the progress of their students.
Gifford, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Teach state standards to students, participate in student data collection of the state standards' mastery, remediates and enriches to provide differentiation to all students, support students in attaining their personal best in academics, and communicate with ESE and ELL teachers as

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		needed. Communicate with parents regarding the progress of their students.
McNeece, Patrick	Administrative Support	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing Rti, ensure implementation of the intervention support and documentation, and ensure adequate development to support Rti implementation. Attends PLCs to provide input and to serve as the education leader, ensuring the state standards are taught with fidelity.
Epstein, Caroline	Instructional Media	Media Specialist: Supports classroom instruction of the state standards, provides opportunities for students to engage with text and media to increase standards mastery.
Schietz, Randi	School Counselor	School Counselor: Supports student social - emotional learning so that students are able to successfully learn. She teaches classes and meets with students in a small group and individual setting to address needs that may be impacting them educationally, socially, or emotionally.
Euell, Shelly	Teacher, K-12	Rtl Facilitator: Provides expertise in interventions and assists school staff with identification of specific student deficiencies and matches students to research-based interventions. She is the Supplemental Academic Instruction Teacher as well: Facilitates, as well as supports data collection in reading instruction activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of intervention plans.
Lozano, SueAnn	Teacher, ESE	Exceptional Student Education (ESE): Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials to support students' IEP curriculum goals. Communicates with parents regarding the IEP and curriculum progress, and collaborates with the general education teachers.
Prazak, Christina	Teacher, K-12	Teach state standards to students, participate in student data collection of the state standards' mastery, remediates and enriches to provide differentiation to all students, support students in attaining their personal best in academics, and communicate with ESE and ELL teachers as needed. Communicate with parents regarding the progress of their students.
MacMillan, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Teach state standards to students, participate in student data collection of the state standards' mastery, remediates and enriches to provide differentiation to all students, support students in attaining their personal best in academics, and communicate with ESE and ELL teachers as

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		needed. Communicate with parents regarding the progress of their students.
Toral, Analucia	ELL Compliance Specialist	Facilitates initial placement assessments and identifies ELL educational placements and support levels. Works with general education teachers to provide strategies, resources, and share data collected for ELL students. Works as a campus liaison to support ELL families with translating and resources.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The School Advisory Council meets eight or more times within a school year to make equitable decisions that ensure all stakeholders are represented and have a voting say on school-wide decisions as they pertain to student learning in both academic-based SIP goals and the learning environments within our campus. We have equitable representation on our SAC as our member ratios reflect the demographics of our student population and surrounding community demographics. Data is prioritized and analyzed by the leadership team and shared at SAC meetings to make decisions and update achievement targets annually.

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))

District and state-level assessment data are collected consistently throughout all grade levels K-5 in all core content areas. Data is used at monthly grade-level meetings to ensure teachers and instructional leaders are accurately meeting the needs of our struggling learners identified as Tier 2 & 3 students using district Decision Tree correlations. The data is revisited using the Decision Tree timeline to adjust students within tiers based on real-time assessment data. Instructional decisions, such as tutorial programs, skill-based grouping, and implementation of remediation resources.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%

2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	30%
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	39	27	23	24	21	27	0	0	0	161	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	5	22	18	19	1	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	5	7	4	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	6	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	12	16	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	15	40	29	23	28	0	0	0	137	

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	6	6	2	8	11	0	0	0	33
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	39	27	23	24	21	27	0	0	0	161	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	3	5	22	18	19	1	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	5	7	4	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	6	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	12	16	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	15	40	29	23	28	0	0	0	137	

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	3	0	9	12	15	13	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	6	9	3	7	10	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	39	27	23	24	21	27	0	0	0	161	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	3	5	22	18	19	1	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	5	7	4	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	6	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	12	16	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	15	40	29	23	28	0	0	0	137	

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	3	0	9	12	15	13	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	6	9	3	7	10	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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*	77	53	53	86	59	56	86		
ELA Learning Gains				76			80		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66			54		
Math Achievement*	79	57	59	85	53	50	86		
Math Learning Gains				76			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			48		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	82	54	54	78	59	59	68		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	71	56	59	83			61		

* 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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
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	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	614
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	52			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	78			
HSP	74			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	71			

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	58			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	77			
HSP	73			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	64			

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	77			79			82					71
SWD	48			56			54				4	
ELL	47			60			58				5	71
AMI												
ASN	85			85							3	
BLK	74			64			92				4	
HSP	71			76			78				5	74
MUL	81			81							2	
PAC												
WHT	81			82			83				4	
FRL	69			67			70				4	

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	86	76	66	85	76	64	78					83
SWD	59	61	52	62	60	58	55					
ELL	59	58	35	66	52	54						83
AMI												
ASN	94	92		89	92							
BLK	84	84		80	79		60					
HSP	83	74	67	81	70	65	64					81
MUL	96	71		87	86							
PAC												
WHT	88	75	64	88	79	66	86					
FRL	72	68	54	74	64	51	52					80

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	86	80	54	86	63	48	68					61
SWD	67	67	50	64	39		35					
ELL	47			79								61

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
AMI												
ASN	100			90								
BLK	82	72		77	61	60	57					
HSP	78	78	46	85	62	36	60					59
MUL	85			80								
PAC												
WHT	91	85	63	88	65	50	75					
FRL	70	72	33	68	45	33	45					50

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	81%	56%	25%	54%	27%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	58%	23%	58%	23%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	48%	28%	50%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	82%	57%	25%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	52%	20%	61%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	*	65%	*	55%	*
05	2023 - Spring	80%	56%	24%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	51%	31%	51%	31%

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.

Data showed that the 4th grade PM3 math achievement percentage was 72% which was our lowest percentage of proficiency using both ELA and Math data points across all tested grade levels (K-5). The increase in rigor from grade 3 to grade 4 mathematics expectations along with a population of students not entering grade 4 with foundational mathematics skills. New teachers hired in this grade level were also contributing factors.

Additionally, our ELL subgroup performance achievement in 2022 was 59% in ELA and 66% in Math. Within this subgroup, the lowest 25% (L25%) displayed a 35% achievement percentage in ELA and 54% in math. This is a lower-performing subgroup compared to our other demographic subgroups and will be an area of focus as we are seeing a consistent trend of growth in our school's ELL population. One contributing factor that stood out to leadership when analyzing data in previous school years was that SY22 was the first year we had a large enough ELL lowest 25% population to be captured within the Accountability Components By Subgroups. WIDA placement testing and providing proper and timely services based on the ELL's needs can at times be a challenge as well at a school of our size.

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

Our reading proficiency percentages decreased in grades 3-5 from SY22 to SY23. Factors include the new implementation of the Benchmark reading curriculum. Teachers were adapting to new resources, attending training, and collaboratively planning to meet the needs of new state assessments.

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

We do not currently have an existing gap and have always outperformed the state. Contributing factors - N/A

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

SY22 and SY23 data showed that our most improved area was Science which increased from 75% (SY22) to 82% (SY23). There was an increased focus on embedding additional science-based text and vocabulary into our ELA planning classes in addition to the Science standards of focus implementation. We made staff and class schedule adjustments prior to the start of SY23 and had grade 5 teachers teaching Science in isolation. Using real-time data throughout the school year allowed us to identify students for our tutorial programs and focus on Science fair game standards during tutorial sessions.

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

Attendance and tardies.

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

- 1.) 3rd-grade reading proficiency
- 2.) 4th-grade mathematics proficiency
- 3.) 5th-grade mathematics proficiency
- 4.) Identifying and monitoring students within tiers based on decision tree timelines and qualifications

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Nationwide teacher shortages have increased leading to greater challenges in recruiting educators. Additionally, the number of registered students is rapidly growing, currently, over 1200 at our school with large-scale new construction communities in our zoned school area. We have an increase in new teacher hires and data shows retaining new hires is a trending challenge. Last year, we had 4 younger teachers decide not to return to school this current year. The reasons were excessive workload and lower pay in comparison to the job to which they were changing.

Required Instruction Florida State Statute 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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of vacancies on our campus (currently one interim first-grade position and one 5th-grade position), FTE data, and Educator Support Program resources and data collection will assist in measuring the overall success of our current recruitment and retention practices. Reviewing SEQ responses and making data-based decisions based on the responses pertaining to Positive Culture and Environment. We strive for a 100% retention rating with our current instructional staff. We do not anticipate any instructional staff retiring at the end of SY24. This year we have 7 new campus teachers whom we will increase our support and focus on through the ESP (Educator Support Program).

Monitoring:

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

SEQs will be collected from teachers. The data from SEQs will be used to determine areas where we are succeeding in providing a satisfactory experience for our teachers as well as areas where we can make improvements. Monthly PLC meeting participation and implementation will be monitored by grade-level team leaders and instructional leadership (Principal & Assistant Principal). PLC's will provide time to look at data and next steps and a time where we can dialogue with all the teachers to ensure that their needs are being met so that they do not become overwhelmed and/or frustrated. Staff will know that they are being fully supported school-wide. Each grade level has an identified staff member from the leadership team who provides guidance and support. PLC's, other meetings, informal check-ins and fun events planned for the staff will be other ways we will monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick McNeece (patrick.mcneece@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No description entered

Person Responsible: Michella Levy (michella.levy@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: May 30, 2024

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

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

To meet the needs of individual students, ensure differentiated instruction is implemented, and help close learning gaps we felt it was vital to focus on small-group instruction. Deliver concept, content, or skill that is aligned with the intended benchmark or skill. Monitor student understanding and provide corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark or intended learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our first goal is to increase our grade 3 ELA proficiency rate from 76 to 81. Additionally, we have a focused goal of increasing our grade 4 & grade 5 ELA proficiency rate from 79 to 84. The determining factor for creating these goals was SY23 PM3 data proficiency rates.

Monitoring:

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

Team leaders, along with one additional identified academic support staff per grade level, will provide data-driven facilitation at monthly PLC meetings. The data collected and disaggregated will include; current PM data, iReady data, and FSQ & USA data. Identify trends in student data and work samples to identify learning needs in order to adjust instruction. We will analyze STAR and FAST PM data reports to make instructional decisions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michella Levy (michella.levy@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

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

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

- SEQ Parent Participation Rates
- SWPBS
- PBIS

Parent Participation Rate in SY23 was 20.8%

A student response rating of only 52.8% within our black student population feels "students respect each other at this school." When asked the same question, 68.5% of female students on our campus felt "students respect each other at this school."

In alignment with 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.

Student Outcome:

Increasing the number of black students (currently 52.8% goal is 62.8% or greater) and female students (currently 68.5% goal is 78.5% or greater) on our campus who feel students respect each other on campus by 10%.

Parent Participation Rates:

Currently at 20.8% for SY23. The goal is to increase this to 40% or greater.

Monitoring:

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

- SEQ data
- PBIS Committee
- SAC Meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michella Levy (michella.levy@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.)

- Schoolwide Discipline Plan
- SWPBS
- Parent Involvement
- Required Instruction Florida State Statute 1003.42 and Policy 2.09

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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. Students are explicitly taught what the desired behavior should be. We utilize "The BINKS Way" school-wide and reinforce this daily in all environments on our campus.
2. SWPBS - Supports the decrease of level of disruptiveness, rates of office referrals, and suspensions,

To improve school climate, safety, and order. To increase instructional time.

3. Parent feedback and involvement improve academics, social skills, and behavior.

4. 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.

Policy 2.09 and Required Instruction Florida State Statue 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 (SLL embedded lessons, grades 4-5, guest speaker for grade 5, morning announcements)

(h) History of Africans and African Americans

(i) History of Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders

(o) Health Education, Life Skills & Social Media

(q) Hispanic Contributors

(r) Women's Contributions

(t) Civic & Character Education

(u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

Curriculum programs address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.

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

Person Responsible: Michella Levy (michella.levy@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: The actions will be implemented and the desired outcome achieved by May 30, 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No