Crosspointe Elementary School

**2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

Table of Contents

Crosspointe Elementary School

3015 S CONGRESS AVE, Boynton Beach, FL 33426

https://cpes.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.

Crosspointe's mission is to provide leadership, social emotional and academic support, and resources to students that will allow for the equitable design and implementation of an effective strategy rich environment across all academic areas to ensure college and career readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Crosspointe's vision is to be a leader in STEM education by preparing and inspiring generations of learners to meet the challenges of the global society through equity. We will foster a culture of active engagement, connection, and applying knowledge with a focus on scientific inquiry, innovation, collaboration, and creative problem solving in a rigorous standards-based interdisciplinary environment.

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
Dilbert, Annmarie	Principal	Administration supports and enforces School-Wide Positive Behavior. They conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure that effective learning is occurring. Administration also monitors data and tracks student progress through data chats with teachers, coaches, and students. The principal and assistant principal hold monthly faculty meetings, parent trainings, and attend professional development sessions. Administrators facilitate instructional meetings and participate in PLC's, common planning, and SBT meetings. They are very involved in parent communication and student achievement.
North, Gina	Assistant Principal	Administration supports and enforces School-Wide Positive Behavior. They conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure that effective learning is occurring. Administration also monitors data and tracks student progress through data chats with teachers, coaches, and students. The principal and assistant principal hold monthly faculty meetings, parent trainings, and attend professional development sessions. Administrators facilitate instructional meetings and participate in PLC's, common planning, and SBT meetings. They are very involved in parent communication and student achievement.
Chapman, Daniel	Math Coach	Mr. Chapman serves as the school math coach and facilitates the PLCs for grades 3-5. Monitors data through Unify, EDW, iReady, Instructional district assessments such as diagnostics, USA's, and FSQ's. Mr. Chapman leads teachers on developing the necessary instructional capacities, through the palm beach model of instruction and coaching cycle. He works collaboratively with administration, parents and community, as SAC chair, to best serve the needs of all students.
Arnold, Karen	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Arnold monitors data through Unify, EDW, Successmaker,and district assessments such as diagnostics, USA's, and FSQ's. She creates ongoing assessments that align with the standards being taught. In addition, she also tracks student progress through the implementation of student tracking forms that are analyzed with teachers. Mrs. Arnold provides ongoing professional development through PDD and and common planning. She support teachers and students through the coaching cycle and organizes and implements tutorials. Mrs. Arnold develops schoolwide content area events with the other coaches throughout the year to promote academic engagement and parent involvement.

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 process utilized to develop our SIP began with a deep dive into previous year student achievement data. From this analysis, our leadership team was able to conduct a root cause analysis in the areas of

3rd grade ELA and 3-5 math proficiency achievement scores. Based on this analysis, our instructional coaches met with leadership to develop a plan for instructional improvement. These instructional strategy plans were then brought into grade level meetings to ensure fidelity and buy-in.

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

The school improvement plan will be monitored through the use iReady diagnostics, district level FSQs and USAs, as well as classroom exit tickets and instructional monitoring by our coaching staff. Students who are identified in our more vulnerable subgroups will be provided increased opportunities for learning by our instructional coaching staff and support teachers.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) 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: C
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	19	21	16	17	12	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	1	5	6	0	0	0	18
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	16	47	75	33	44	0	0	0	215
Course failure in Math	0	13	35	57	18	27	0	0	0	150
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	22	41	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	16	44	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	47	75	33	44	0	0	0	215

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	13	33	61	29	49	0	0	0	185

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	32	14	18	17	9	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	2	3	5	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	24	16	84	59	60	0	0	0	0	243
Course failure in Math	13	14	55	57	32	0	0	0	0	171
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	23	22	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	33	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	31	33	16	24	13	0	0	0	126

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	22	24	27	30	31	0	0	0	134

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	6	15	23	19	13	0	0	0	86
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	32	14	18	17	9	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	2	3	5	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	24	16	84	59	60	0	0	0	0	243
Course failure in Math	13	14	55	57	32	0	0	0	0	171
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	23	22	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	33	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	31	33	16	24	13	0	0	0	126

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	22	24	27	30	31	0	0	0	134

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	6	15	23	19	13	0	0	0	86
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*	44	53	53	55	59	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				67			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			61		
Math Achievement*	49	57	59	49	53	50	37		
Math Learning Gains				66			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71			26		
Science Achievement*	46	54	54	24	59	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	56	59	67			51		

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	236
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
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	20	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	44			
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			
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	45			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	56			
HSP	59			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	57			

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	44			49			46					48
SWD	19			19			15				5	22
ELL	39			50			39				5	48
AMI												
ASN	69			77							2	
BLK	39			45			43				5	47
HSP	57			59			60				5	54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50			50							2	
FRL	43			48			42				5	46

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	67	59	49	66	71	24					67
SWD	33	62	72	20	52	65	5					54
ELL	50	57	48	44	64	77	18					67
AMI												
ASN	70			80								
BLK	52	67	60	46	66	72	22					65
HSP	62	61		49	64		30					85
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	80		59	60							
FRL	55	66	60	47	64	70	23					67

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	45	58	61	37	22	26	29					51
SWD	27	48	54	21	19	31	9					36
ELL	39	49	58	32	24	29	22					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	54	56	34	24	25	33					50
HSP	49	67		43	17		11					47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			38								
FRL	44	56	59	36	22	27	28					51

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	55%	56%	-1%	54%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	58%	-18%	58%	-18%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	48%	-5%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	57%	-3%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	52%	-12%	61%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	51%	-6%

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.

FY22 FY23
ELA
3 50.8% 42.7%
4 58.4% 39.8%
5 49.4% 54.6%
SWDs 34.9% 21.8%
Blacks 49.5% 41.3%
Math
3 43.7% 54.4%
4 65.0% 39.8%
5 29.2% 52.6%
SWDs 22.3% 18.2%
Blacks 44% 45.1%
Science
5 23.9% 45.4%
SWDs 9.1% 11.5%
Blacks 20.9% 42.1%

Based on 2022-2023 student achievement data, our fourth grade ELA proficiency showed the lowest performance. 39.8% of our FY23 fourth grade students were performing on grade level in ELA. Large class size, low instructional capacity, and the transition from paper-based to a computer-based assessments were all contributing factors to low ELA performance. While data showed that our lowest level of performing students were improving, our students were not able to improve past the threshold of proficiency.

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

From FY22 to FY23 our fourth grade math proficiency levels showed the largest decline. In the 2021-2022 school year our 4th grade math students were at 65% proficiency and in the most recent year that number dropped 25 percentage points to 39.8%. Large class size, low levels of instructional capacity, and limited behavior management were key factors in this decline.

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

When compared to the state average, our largest gap was in the area of fourth grade math. The state had 61% of students obtain a level 3 or higher, whereas CPE has 39.8% of students in proficiency. Large class size, low levels of instructional capacity, and limited behavior management were key factors in this decline.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was in 5th grade math. In FY22 29.2% of the students were at or above the proficiency threshold. This number improved to 52.6% in FY23, a growth of 23.4%. Common planning meetings, backwards design, and increased aggressive monitoring of student data all were contributing factors to this improvement.

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

Based on the EWS data, the rate of absenteeism among the students at CPE is a glaring concern. With 85 students having more than 10 absences, more than 10% of our school population has chronic absence issues and thus is missing out on essential core instruction. An additional concern was the number of students receiving Needs Development in the area of ELA. These numbers indicate that one-third of every student on our campus is reading at severely below grade-level proficiency.

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

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

1. Increase instructional capacity through Professional Learning Communities focused on analyzing student data, increasing instructional best practices, and planning for future implementations.
2. Create systems in which teachers and support staff are actively monitoring both formative and summative assessment data to best prepare for individualized, differentiated small group instruction.
3. Increased behavior management practices

4. Teacher recruitment and retention

Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:
(g) History of the Holocaust
(h) History of Africans and African Americans
(i) History of Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders
(o) Health Education, Life Skills & Social Media
(q) Hispanic Contributions
(r) Women's Contributions
(t) Civic & Character Education
(u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients
2. Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.
3. Our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts.

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

#1. 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.

Our area of focus for improving our culture and school environment will be decreasing the number of students who have 10 or more absences.

Attendance Data for students who had 10 or more absences:
FY22: 90 students
FY23: 85 students

Within the 85 FY23 students with 10 or more absences, nearly half of these students are within our FY23 first and second grade classrooms. This is presenting an issue as without the foundational skills, these students tend to perform below grade level throughout the intermediate years. 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.

Our measurable goal is to reduce the number or students with 10 or more absences by 10% by the end of the FY24 school year.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through monthly reviews by our SAC committee of absence and discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Chapman (daniel.chapman@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 Attendance Plan

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

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.

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.

Students will be afforded the opportunity to be recognized as students of the month at monthly SAC meetings. This will benefit the students by providing a positive incentive, leading to higher rates of attendance.

Person Responsible: Daniel Chapman (daniel.chapman@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Beginning August and running monthly over the course of the SY24 school year.

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: Karen Arnold (karen.arnold@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: March 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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

Based on the SY23 data, it is evident there are pockets of instructional success among our teams of teachers. By focusing on collaborative planning, we can increase teacher capacity and lead to higher academic outcomes.

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

Our measurable goal for the SY24 school year will be a 5% increase in attendance of teachers at PLC Meetings.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the keeping of attendance at PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Chapman (daniel.chapman@palmbeachschools.org)

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

The evidence-based intervention used in this area of focus will be based on the work of Dufour and Fullan on the impact successful professional learning communities have on overall academic outcomes. By setting norms, goals, and collaborating through collective inquiry teams will become stronger and more accountable for each other and the performance of their students.

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

The rationale for this specific strategy is based on the impact accountability and collective efficacy have on rates of student achievement. Based on studies by John Hattie, the belief of teachers in their own teaching has the largest impact on student performance. By working collaboratively on lessons to determine the most effective instructional strategies and work through educator and student misconceptions, levels of confidence and student achievement will increase.

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.

Teams will work collaboratively to set the agenda prior to PLC meetings, this will increase the level of participation and buy-in at PLC meetings. Due to the buy-in levels of attendance will increase.

Person Responsible: Daniel Chapman (daniel.chapman@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: This will begin in the first PLC cycle and remain consistent throughout the year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA
If we focus on Standards-based instruction to increase overall K-2 proficiency school-wide in ELA, then we will
increase student proficiency in 3rd grade and ensure alignment to the District #39;s Strategic Plan, Theme 1
Academic Excellence and Growth. Our instructional priority is to monitor student understanding and provide
corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

According to the data our students are not entering third grade prepared for the rigors of the standards and
state assessment. According to iReady FY23 data 54% of our incoming third grade students are reading at an
on-grade level data.

Proficiency Rates:
Kindergarten: 80% Proficient
First Grade: 60% Proficient
Second Grade: 54% Proficient

Foundational Skills Data:
Phonological awareness: 88% Proficient
Phonics: 72% Proficient
High-Frequency Words: 88% Proficient
Vocabulary: 51% Proficient

Students overall reading comprehension proficiency is 56% for literature
text and 47% for nonfiction text.

FY23 STAR on track data:
PM1 PM2 PM3

K: 37% 52% 58%
1st: 51 % 53% 33%
2nd: 52% 50% 51%

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

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

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

FY22 FSA to FY23 FAST
3rd: 50.8% 42.7%
4th: 58.4% 39.8%
5th: 49.4% 54.6%
SWDs: 34.9% 21.8%
Blacks 49.5% 41.3%

FY23 FAST Grades 3-5 on track data:
PM1 PM2 PM3
3rd: 46% 47% 43%
4th: 47% 39% 40%
5th: 52% 58% 55%

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The measurable outcomes in grades K-2 for 2023 are:

February 2023 May 2023
K: 52% On Track 58% On Track
1st: 53% On Track 33% On Track
2nd: 50% On Track 51% On Track

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The measurable outcomes in grades 3-5 for 2023 are:

3rd: 47% Proficient 43% Proficient
4th: 39% Proficient 40% Proficient
5th: 58% Proficient 55% Proficient

Monitoring

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

Monitoring is a crucial step towards student achievement and school improvement. It provides teachers and administration the data that they need to make decisions about instruction and differentiated support for the students. Monitoring will occur throughout our CPM's for each grade level. Each team will analyze FAST, iReady, FSQ's, and USA data. Administration will conduct walkthroughs, teachers will have data chats with students and administration will meet with teachers to review data along with discussing goals with students.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dilbert, Annmarie, annmarie.dilbert@palmbeachschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

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

Teachers will use the following evidence-based interventions depending on the student deficiencies:

Phonological Awareness:
Heggerty T2 or T3 (K-5 only for phonological awareness)
Sounds Sensible T2 or T3
SPIRE T2 or T3
Wilson T3 (2-5 only)
Voyager Passport T2 (K-3 only for phonological awareness, for grades 4 & 5 use SPIRE or Wilson)

Phonics deficiency:
Sounds Sensible T2 or T3

SPIRE T2 or T3
Wilson T3 (2-5 only)
Voyager Passport T2 (K-3 for phonics, not for grades 4 & 5 phonics- for grades 4 & 5 phonics deficiency use SPIRE or Wilson)

Text processing / fluency deficiency:
SPIRE T2 or T3
LLI T2 or T3
Voyager Passport T2
Guided Reading T2 or T3
Shared Reading T2 or T3
Wilson T3 (2-5 only)

Comprehension / vocabulary deficiency:
Voyager T2
LLI T2 or T3
Guided Reading T2 or T3
Shared Reading T2 or T3

*Small group instruction: teachers as well as supplemental support teachers will provide strategically, differentiated instructional support for all learners.
*Professional Development: teachers and support staff will attend ongoing professional development to engage in deep, focused, collaborative planning to support and strengthen data analysis and small group
planning and implementation
*Common Planning Meetings will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies. PD will support the development of teacher expertise and share best practices among the group.

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

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

*Incorporate small group instruction utilizing current data to address the individual needs.
*Weekly assessments will be used to support growth within the standards. Small group rotations will allow for more one-on-one attention students need to observe their learning in action and to be able to provide timely feedback
*Teachers will receive ongoing PD to help them plan, organize, and implement consistent and differentiated
instruction for all students. Teachers will target remediation and enrichment within their planning and PD. It
also fosters a positive and inclusive learning culture, where students feel valued, respected, and motivated. By differentiating instruction and assessment, teachers can enhance the quality and effectiveness
of teaching and learning
*CPM's allow teachers and leadership an opportunity to collaborate, to analyze data, and to make decisions to
improve student achievement and progress. Teachers are able to share best practices.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The leadership team will monitor implementation of the schools plan by analyzing data, conducting walkthroughs, meeting with staff for data chats, providing glows and grows, and making sure proper professional development is provided. *Small group instruction will be implemented to differentiate instruction *Students will be assessed using FAST K-2 STAR, FAST 3-5 Cambium, iReady, Benchmark Unit Assessments and FSQ's *Teachers will analyze student data to determine strengths and weaknesses *Teachers will create lesson plans utilizing a variety of resources, instructional materials, and teaching methodologies *Teachers will follow the district assessment schedule of ongoing formative assessments to track student learning & adjust instruction continuously *Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework to ensure students are provided with the specific instruction, resources, time, and intensity needed for success. *Use K-5 Reading intervention with guidelines for schools to determine students' needs *School admin and coaches attend training on the operational plan for collection and regular review of progress monitoring data to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction in Core (Tier 1) and to monitor progress of students receiving Supplemental (Tier 2) and Intensive (Tier 3) interventions. *School leaders share the plan with staff in faculty meetings and CPM's *Ongoing data collection and review meetings will be scheduled between the District Reading Collaboration team and Regional/Instructional Superintendents to determine individual school needs and provide additional training and support. *The District Reading Collaboration team provides professional development to schools based on needs. *SSCC will create an ongoing PD session that consist of mandatory and voluntary sessions that teachers will attend. *SSCC & coaches will provide ongoing modeling, pre and post conferences, and in class room support *ongoing observations conducted by admin with feedback will be provided to teachers. *The CPM sessions will focus on data analysis & effective instruction based on the needs	Dilbert, Annmarie, annmarie.dilbert@palmbeachschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

All Title I schools in SDPBC are required to complete a Schoolwide Plan (SWP) where the answers to these questions are addressed. This information is located on the District Title 1 website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A