**The School District of Palm Beach County** 

# Royal Palm Beach 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                            | 13 |
|   |    |
| III. Planning for Improvement                               | 18 |
|   |    |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review                       | 24 |
|   |    |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0  |
|   |    |
| VI. Title I Requirements                                    | 0  |
|   |    |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus                       | 24 |

# **Royal Palm Beach Elementary School**

11911 OKEECHOBEE BLVD, Royal Palm Beach, FL 33411

https://rpbe.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), <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">https://www.floridacims.org</a>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections   | Title I Schoolwide Program                                      | Charter Schools        |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)   |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)   |                        |
| I-E: Early Warning System  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)                                    | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-A-C: Data Review  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring  | ESSA 1114(b)(3)   |                        |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection                                    | ESSA 1114(b)(6)   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)   |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)                                       |                        |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements   | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

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

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

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

### I. School Information

#### **School Mission and Vision**

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

The mission of Royal Palm Beach Elementary School is to provide a nurturing environment which will promote positive self esteem, academic accountability, develop technological advancements, and social and global awareness, among all culturally diverse students.

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

The vision of Royal Palm Beach Elementary School is to provide students with effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of ALL students in a positive, supportive school climate.

#### 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Ghettie, Tracy       | Principal              | Mrs. Ghettie is our principal. She serves as our Instructional Leader responsible for monitoring implementation of our school-wide instructional strategies, analyzing student achievement data, providing support to staff, students, and families, and monitoring progress toward meeting school goals. Mrs. Ghettie cares deeply about the school and community with all her heart, continually advocates for the best services and support for our students and staff, as well as promotes a positive climate for all stakeholders. |
| Fong, Cristina       | Assistant<br>Principal | Mrs. Fong is our Assistant Principal. She serves as our Instructional Leader responsible for monitoring implementation of school-wide instructional strategies, analyzing student achievement data, providing support to staff, students, and families, and monitoring progress toward meeting school goals. Mrs. Fong is an invaluable asset to our team. Her attention to detail, dedication to our school and families, and extra attention she provides to our students is absolutely amazing.                                      |
| Ruiz, Sarah          | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Mrs. Ruiz is a Second Grade Teacher and serves as our SAC Chair. Mrs. Ruiz is a phenomenal teacher who loves her students like her own children and holds high expectations for all. She is responsible for providing Standards-based instruction in her self-contained classroom, monitoring students' progress toward meeting grade level standards in a nurturing, inviting classroom environment. Additionally, Mrs. Ruiz serves on the 2nd Grade District Math Cadre and is our District Math/Science Fair Coordinator.            |
| Morris,<br>Michelle  | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Mrs. Morris is our Kindergarten Grade Chair responsible for providing Standards-based Instruction in her self-contained classroom, Grade Level Leadership & Support, and monitoring standards-based planning. Mrs. Morris does a great job helping our incoming kindergarteners and families transition from the preschool setting to the elementary school setting. She helps create a nurturing, caring environment for all our kindergarten Bobcats and keeps in touch with her students for years after they complete kindergarten! |
| Kennedy,<br>Cristina | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Mrs. Kennedy is our 1st Grade Chair responsible for providing Standards-based Instruction in her self-contained first grade classroom, Grade Level Leadership and Support, and monitoring Standards-based planning for her team. Mrs. Kennedy is an amazing, caring teacher who helps promote a positive climate with our students and staff through her enthusiasm and energy.   |
| Barker, Sherry       | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Mrs. Barker is our Second Grade Chair and is responsible for providing Standards-based instruction in her self-contained 2nd grade classroom, Grade Level Leadership and Support, and monitoring Standards-based planning for her team. Mrs. Barker is very creative and is an amazing history teacher.   |

| Name                      | Position<br>Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Guelli, Elaine            | Teacher,<br>K-12  | Mrs. Guelli is our 3rd Grade Chair, and is one of our nine original Bobcat staff! Being a member of our Royal Palm Beach Elementary School faculty since our school opened, she has a great knowledge of our school and community. Mrs. Guelli is responsible for providing Standards-based Instruction, facilitating grade level planning and PLCs, and providing additional support to faculty new to our school (and to her grade level). Mrs. Guelli always sets very high academic expectations and standards, and helps her students achieve at the highest levels.             |
| Herring,<br>Melissa       | Teacher,<br>K-12  | Mrs. Herring is our 4th Grade Chair responsible for ELA Instruction, Grade Level Leadership and Support, and monitoring for Standards-based Planning. Mrs. Herring is our Flocabulary expert, providing support to all teachers K-5 to supplement their classroom instruction with this amazing resource, serves as our Elementary Report Card Contact, and helps teachers see the importance of analyzing data and using current data to drive future instruction. She holds very high expectations for all her students and is an amazing support to students, peers, and families. |
| Ebersold,<br>Jennifer     | Teacher,<br>K-12  | Mrs. Ebersold is our 5th Grade Chair, responsible for providing Standards-based Math/Science Instruction to both her homeroom (AMP) and her partner's homeroom, grade level Leadership & Support. Mrs. Ebersold is passionate in her belief that all children can learn when given the appropriate levels of support and encouragement, does an amazing job analyzing data and making data-based instructional decisions, and facilitating grade level plannings and PLCs.  |
| Moseley,<br>Gladys        | Teacher,<br>K-12  | Mrs. Moseley serves as our ESOL Coordinator/Teacher, responsible for monitoring compliance with students with LEPs and services they are receiving as well as tracking progress. Mrs. Moseley has been a member of our Bobcat Team since our school opened! She supports new teachers to our school, has great relationships with our families and community members, and makes a positive difference at Royal Palm Beach Elementary School.  |
| Prinyavivatkul,<br>Alison | Teacher,<br>ESE   | Mrs. Prinyavivatkul is our SLP Grade Chair responsible for providing Standards-based Instruction, Grade Level Leadership and Support. Mrs. Prinyavivatkul forms amazing, positive relationships with her students and families, and serves as a role model and advocate for our students on the autism spectrum as well as those students with communication/language needs. She is a great mentor to new SLPs at our school.   |
| Wood,<br>Michelle         | Teacher,<br>ESE   | Mrs. Wood serves as our ESE Coordinator, responsible for monitoring compliance with students with IEPs and services they are receiving as well as tracking progress. Mrs. Wood is the most organized person and does an amazing job advocating for our SWD, scheduling and ensuring they receive the best possible support.   |

| Name                   | Position<br>Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Rajan, Ruvini          | Teacher,<br>ESE   | Mrs. Rajan is our ASD Grade Chair responsible for providing Standards-based Instruction, Grade Level Leadership and Support. Mrs. Rajan forms amazing, positive relationships with her students and families, and serves as a role model and advocate for our students on the autism spectrum. She volunteers at school-wide events and cares deeply about our school and community.  |
| Kovalsky,<br>Katherine | Teacher,<br>K-12  | Mrs. Kovalsky is our Bobcat Music Teacher and Fine Arts Grade Chair, responsible for providing music instruction to all students K-5, as well as Fine Arts Team Leadership and Support. Mrs. Kovalsky is a 2022 Dwyer Award recipient who sponsors our Bobcat Chorus, Bobcat Ringers (Handbells), and promotes the importance of arts education throughout our school and community. She is very much respected by her peers, students, and families. |

#### 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.

All stakeholders work together to develop our School Improvement Plan.

Our School Behavioral Health Professional (BHP) supports the behavioral and mental health of students and

works along with our school counselor.

Our ESOL Coordinator and Community Language Facilitator work in conjunction with the District's multicultural

department to ensure the fidelity of implementation of programs and services designed to improve the outcomes of English Language Learners.

Our School District Resource Officer is on campus every day for the safety and security of all students and staff. Our school has a single point of entry for everyone. Fortify Florida Application is on every computer, and students are made aware of this through school-wide assemblies.

Our School Guidance Counselor and Data Processor work in partnership with families and the District McKinney-Vento liaison to ensure the needs of these families and students are met.

Our ESE Coordinator works closely with our School Psychologist as well as educators, families, and advocates to make sure all of our students receive appropriate levels of support, in compliance with students' IEPs.

Grade Level teachers work together to team plan, share resources, look closely at standards, and track student data.

Professional Development is provided based on teacher need and surveys.

Administrative team works closely with faculty and staff, monitors for safety & learning, and regularly observes in classrooms providing specific feedback, praise, and suggestions for improvement.

Our Bobcat SAC meets monthly to review data, track progress toward meeting school-wide goals, review strategies included in our plan for improvement, and share suggestions to help make our school the very best!

#### SIP Monitoring

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

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a living document that memorializes the continuous improvement work we are involved with at Royal Palm Beach Elementary School. The SIP is updated throughout the year to ensure proper documentation of the amazing work that takes place here every day.

Continuous improvement is at the forefront of what we do. We work collaboratively to review and analyze data. We make decisions based on the data to ensure all students receive the necessary support and accommodations during instruction. Our team consistently works towards the following student achievement goals:

- Strategic planning
- Developing action steps towards improvement
- · Creating and maintaining a culture of collaboration towards shared decision-making
- Supporting professional learning and improvement

Monitoring will take place throughout the year. We will monitor mastery of grade level benchmarks through the use of a variety of assessments including: iReady Diagnostics, FSQs, USAs, State Progress Monitoring, and classroom assessments/observations.

The annual test administered for ELL students is WIDA ACCESS. The WIDA is used to assess ELL students' proficiency in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Teachers are trained by the ESOL Coordinator to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction based on the results of data.

Professional Learning Communities, Instructional Leadership Team meetings, Faculty meetings, PTO Meetings, and School Advisory Council meetings are all used to review our academic achievements/ progress as well as plan ahead making necessary adjustments as needed.

Teachers follow the scope and sequence as outlined on the Palm Beach County curriculum resource on blender and C-Palms. This ensures that teachers have a concrete timeline as well as the resources to provide quality instruction on the mandated curriculum.

#### **Demographic Data**

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

| 2023-24 Status<br>(per MSID File)             | Active                 |
|---|------------------------|
| School Type and Grades Served                 | Elementary School      |
| (per MSID File)                               | KG-5                   |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File)          | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status                 | No                     |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate                         | 70%                    |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 67%                    |
| 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<br>2019-20: A<br>2018-19: A<br>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   |    | Total |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |       |
|---|----|-------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| mulcator  |    | 1     | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | TOLAT |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 32 | 13    | 21 | 15 | 11 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115   |
| One or more suspensions   | 1  | 1     | 5  | 0  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 18 | 16    | 33 | 13 | 19 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130   |
| Course failure in Math  | 12 | 8     | 22 | 16 | 18 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101   |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0  | 0     | 0  | 21 | 19 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0  | 0     | 0  | 22 | 19 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0  | 2     | 3  | 16 | 8  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34    |

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                            |    |   |    | Grad | e Lev | el |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|----|---|----|------|-------|----|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator                            | K  | 1 | 2  | 3    | 4     | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 14 | 9 | 21 | 22   | 23    | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130   |

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

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|
| indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |  |  |  |
| 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 |    |    |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |
|---|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|
| indicator   |   | 1  | 2  | 3           | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0 | 17 | 25 | 12          | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82    |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 0 | 0  | 3  | 0           | 6  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9     |  |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0 | 9  | 21 | 23          | 28 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131   |  |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0 | 4  | 13 | 12          | 8  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56    |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 2           | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29    |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0           | 2  | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31    |  |  |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 1  | 8  | 3           | 2  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24    |  |  |  |

#### The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            |   |   |    | Grad | de Le | vel |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|----|------|-------|-----|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator                            | K | 1 | 2  | 3    | 4     | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 4 | 15 | 11   | 20    | 37  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87    |

#### The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator                           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9     |
| 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   |   |    | Total |    |    |    |   |   |   |       |
|---|---|----|-------|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator   | K | 1  | 2     | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | TOTAL |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0 | 17 | 25    | 12 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0 | 0  | 3     | 0  | 6  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0 | 9  | 21    | 23 | 28 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131   |
| Course failure in Math  | 0 | 4  | 13    | 12 | 8  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0 | 0  | 0     | 2  | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 2  | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 1  | 8     | 3  | 2  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24    |

#### The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator                            | K           | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 4 | 15 | 11 | 20 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87    |

#### The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator                           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9     |
| 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   |          |       |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| Accountability Component    | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement*            | 59     | 53       | 53    | 70     | 59       | 56    | 63     |          |       |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 77     |          |       | 67     |          |       |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 65     |          |       | 45     |          |       |  |
| Math Achievement*           | 63     | 57       | 59    | 64     | 53       | 50    | 58     |          |       |  |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 72     |          |       | 54     |          |       |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 56     |          |       | 30     |          |       |  |

| Accountability Component           |        | 2023     |       |        | 2022     |       | 2021   |          |       |  |
|------------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| Accountability Component           | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| Science Achievement*               | 63     | 54       | 54    | 51     | 59       | 59    | 64     |          |       |  |
| Social Studies Achievement*        |        |          |       |        | 66       | 64    |        |          |       |  |
| Middle School Acceleration         |        |          |       |        | 54       | 52    |        |          |       |  |
| Graduation Rate                    |        |          |       |        | 47       | 50    |        |          |       |  |
| College and Career<br>Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |  |
| ELP Progress                       | 67     | 56       | 59    | 71     |          |       | 67     |          |       |  |

<sup>\*</sup> 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           | 62  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 308 |
| 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           | 66  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 526 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

### **ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

|                  |                                       | 2022-23 ESS              | SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMA                                | RY  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |
| SWD              | 28                                    | Yes                      | 1   | 1   |
| ELL              | 47                                    |                          |   |   |
| AMI              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| ASN              | 59                                    |                          |   |   |
| BLK              | 58                                    |                          |   |   |
| HSP              | 56                                    |                          |   |   |
| MUL              | 78                                    |                          |   |   |
| PAC              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| WHT              | 65                                    |                          |   |   |
| FRL              | 59                                    |                          |   |   |

|                  |                                       | 2021-22 ES               | SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMAF                               | RY  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |
| SWD              | 42                                    |                          |   |   |
| ELL              | 71                                    |                          |   |   |
| AMI              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| ASN              | 75                                    |                          |   |   |
| BLK              | 59                                    |                          |   |   |
| HSP              | 68                                    |                          |   |   |
| MUL              | 85                                    |                          |   |   |
| PAC              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| WHT              | 67                                    |                          |   |   |
| FRL              | 62                                    |                          |   |   |

### **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)

|                 |             |        | 2022-2         | 3 ACCOU      | NTABILIT   | Y COMPO            | NENTS BY    | SUBGRO  | UPS          |                         |                           |                 |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2021-22 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2021-22 | ELP<br>Progress |
| All<br>Students | 59          |        |                | 63           |            |                    | 63          |         |              |                         |                           | 67              |
| SWD             | 29          |        |                | 39           |            |                    | 27          |         |              |                         | 4                         |                 |
| ELL             | 42          |        |                | 42           |            |                    | 38          |         |              |                         | 4                         | 67              |
| AMI             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ASN             | 56          |        |                | 61           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         | 2                         |                 |
| BLK             | 56          |        |                | 65           |            |                    | 59          |         |              |                         | 4                         |                 |
| HSP             | 56          |        |                | 56           |            |                    | 60          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 62              |
| MUL             | 81          |        |                | 75           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         | 2                         |                 |
| PAC             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| WHT             | 63          |        |                | 65           |            |                    | 66          |         |              |                         | 4                         |                 |
| FRL             | 58          |        |                | 54           |            |                    | 59          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 67              |

|                 |             |        | 2021-2         | 2 ACCOU      | NTABILIT   | Y COMPO            | NENTS BY    | SUBGRO  | UPS          |                         |                           |                 |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 | ELP<br>Progress |
| All<br>Students | 70          | 77     | 65             | 64           | 72         | 56                 | 51          |         |              |                         |                           | 71              |
| SWD             | 48          | 57     | 44             | 38           | 51         | 35                 | 20          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ELL             | 62          | 81     | 83             | 67           | 84         | 64                 | 59          |         |              |                         |                           | 71              |
| AMI             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ASN             | 67          | 85     |                | 56           | 92         |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| BLK             | 61          | 69     | 62             | 59           | 71         | 54                 | 34          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| HSP             | 72          | 78     | 73             | 65           | 72         |                    | 48          |         |              |                         |                           | 71              |
| MUL             | 76          | 91     |                | 71           | 100        |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| PAC             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| WHT             | 74          | 81     | 63             | 67           | 68         | 50                 | 67          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| FRL             | 63          | 71     | 60             | 57           | 68         | 55                 | 41          |         |              |                         |                           | 78              |

|                 | 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
|-----------------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 | ELP<br>Progress |
| All<br>Students | 63   | 67     | 45             | 58           | 54         | 30                 | 64          |         |              |                         |                           | 67              |
| SWD             | 42   | 47     |                | 38           | 41         |                    | 53          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ELL             | 65   |        |                | 52           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           | 67              |

|           | 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
|-----------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 | ELP<br>Progress |
| AMI       |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ASN       | 73   | 80     |                | 55           | 70         |                    | 80          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| BLK       | 48   | 52     |                | 47           | 36         |                    | 48          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| HSP       | 66   | 78     |                | 58           | 59         |                    | 60          |         |              |                         |                           | 65              |
| MUL       | 83   |        |                | 61           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| PAC       |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| WHT       | 67   | 67     |                | 66           | 63         |                    | 73          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| FRL       | 55   | 56     | 33             | 46           | 40         | 24                 | 51          |         |              |                         |                           | 67              |

#### 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 60%    | 56%      | 4%                                | 54%   | 6%                             |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 74%    | 58%      | 16%                               | 58%   | 16%                            |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 52%    | 48%      | 4%                                | 50%   | 2%                             |

|       |               |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 100%   | 54%      | 46%                               | 54%   | 46%                            |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 60%    | 57%      | 3%                                | 59%   | 1%                             |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 70%    | 52%      | 18%                               | 61%   | 9%                             |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 61%    | 56%      | 5%                                | 55%   | 6%                             |

|       |               |        | SCIENCE  |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 62%    | 51%      | 11%                               | 51%   | 11%                            |

### **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.

Science results showed the lowest performance with 62% of our students performing at proficient levels on the State Science Assessment. Although this was our component with the lowest performance, this was an 11% gain from the 2021-2022 school year.

Throughout Distance Learning and Blended Learning, our focus was mainly on literacy and math, and we found it very difficult to incorporate hands-on science experiments and learning throughout these platforms.

Since returning to all in person learning, we are continuing to work on filling the gaps in science content and knowledge through implementing STEAM Labs for all our students K-2nd Grade as well as opportunities for our 3rd-5th Graders to participate in after-school extension science clubs. Teachers are focusing on using appropriate scientific vocabulary, K-5, and regularly planning hands-on science experiments on every grade level.

We believe that building a strong interest in Science throughout the primary grades will help build a better foundation to future scientific learning in grades 3-5.

Additional vocabulary challenges are being provided weekly to our 5th grade students to review science vocabulary taught throughout elementary school, providing additional support/reteach as necessary.

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

Overall ELA achievement dropped from 70% proficient in FY22 to 63% during FY23. Although we are disappointed in the 7% drop in ELA proficiency, as a faculty we learned a lot last year. We implemented Benchmark Literacy and participated in the brand new Progress Monitoring Assessments 1, 2, and 3 throughout the year. On going professional development and support were provided with regards to the implementation of our new Literacy Program.

Having worked and learning more every day last year, we are now in a better place to supplement current materials/programs to better meet the needs of our students as they deepen their literacy skills and knowledge.

# 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.

FY23 FAST Data reveals that Royal Palm Beach Elementary Students were well about the State and District averages:

Grades 3-5 ELA  $\sim$  State 50% proficient, District 48% proficient, Royal Palm Beach Elementary 67% proficient

Grades 3-5 Math ~ State 59% proficient, District 57% proficient, Royal Palm Beach Elementary 64% proficient

Grade 5 Science ~ State 51% proficient, District 51% proficient, Royal Palm Beach Elementary 62% proficient

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

Our school showed the most improvement in the area of Science as measured by FY23 State Standardized Science testing. Our results include a 12% gain in proficiency from the 2021-2022 school

year.

In order to supplement and remediate our science instruction last year (due to learning loss during the pandemic), we focused on scientific vocabulary school-wide.

Key scientific vocabulary posters were displayed in common areas (such as hallways, stairways, cafeteria) and used throughout the day in all grades K-5. We held various challenges with our students to find specific science words throughout our school, share new vocab with friends, share the meanings of science terminology, utilize science word walls in all classrooms, and develop science journals in grades 3-5.

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

Reviewing scatterplot data, our school is identified as high achieving, high growth in the area of Math and high achieving, low growth in the area of ELA.

Although we are very proud to be in the high achieving categories in both ELA and Math, we are going to focus on ELA growth for all students.

Looking more closely at ELA reporting categories, our students in grades 3-5 struggled most at the beginning of the year with Reading Across Genres Vocabulary, and made the most growth in that area. Although this area showed the most growth, we are only slightly above the District average in this category.

Additionally, we have a very large percentage of students in every grade level scoring at/near the standard (49-64%). We will be providing additional support (remediation, maintenance, enrichment opportunities) for all students to help reduce our students

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

ELA Growth
Reading Across Genres Vocabulary
Reading Informational Text
Math Intervention

#### **Area of Focus**

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

#### **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Data Analysis reveals an overall drop of 7% with regard to our ELA Proficiency from FY22 to FY23. Although our school is still considered "high performance" in ELA, we are also considered "low growth." FY23 FAST results include 63% ELA proficiency with the following proficiency rates:

White Female ~ 67%
Black Female ~ 70%
Hispanic Female ~ 63%
ELL Female ~ 35%
SWD Female ~ 15%
White Male ~ 67%
Black Male ~ 57%
Hispanic Male ~ 52%
ELL Male ~ 32%
SWD Male ~ 19%

#### **Measurable Outcome:**

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

A minimum of 75% of our students in grades K-5 will read on grade level by the end of the year as measured by K-2 STAR Progress Monitoring and 3-5 FAST Progress Monitoring. Additionally, ELL will improve proficiency by at least 10%.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

All teachers responsible for ELA instruction will implement the Benchmark Literacy Program and follow our District Scope & Sequence. This will be monitored through classroom walk throughs and observations as well as lesson plan checks.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Ghettie (tracy.ghettie@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.)

Teachers will analyze iReady Diagnostic Data, PM1 Data, ORR, and classroom observations to identify various levels of support needed for their students' reading (meeting the standards, approaching, supplemental, or intensive).

Core Instruction (Tier 1) will be provided to all students through the implementation of the Benchmark Literacy Program, following our District's Scope and Sequence with approved instructional materials. Research-based programs will be used to provide Supplemental (Tier 2) and Intensive (Tier 3) support as needed. PMPs will be utilized to formalize how every team member (teacher, parent, student) will support reading progress/literacy development throughout the school year.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Grade Level PLCs will be utilized to analyze current student data, track individual students' progress toward meeting standards, discuss future instruction, and identify appropriate, District-approved instructional materials to be used.

Professional Development will be provided to support teachers' growth in their knowledge and application of the Science of Reading.

#### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

#### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will analyze iReady Diagnostic Data, PM1 Data, ORR, and classroom observations to identify various levels of support needed for their students' reading (meeting the standards, approaching, supplemental, or intensive).

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Ghettie (tracy.ghettie@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023

Core Instruction (Tier 1) will be provided to all students through the implementation of the Benchmark Literacy Program, following our District's Scope and Sequence with approved instructional materials.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Ghettie (tracy.ghettie@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Research-based programs, based on students' individual needs will be used to provide Supplemental (Tier 2) and Intensive (Tier 3) support as needed. PMPs will be utilized to formalize how every team member (teacher, parent, student) will support reading progress/literacy development throughout the school year.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Ghettie (tracy.ghettie@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: ongoing throughout the year

#### #2. 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 focus is to improve student attendance and time on task throughout the instructional day. The more on task time students spend with their teachers in school, the higher their academic achievements will be! Similarly, the more connected, capable, and contributing each student feels, will result in improved academic results.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

Out of class discipline referrals will be reduced by at least 10% from FY23, and student attendance will improve by at least 10% compared with FY23 student attendance.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

Monthly behavior & attendance reports will be monitored, and analyzed for any trends.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cristina Fong (cristina.fong@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.)

School Wide Positive Behavior Support

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The more on task time students spend with their teachers in school, the higher their academic achievements will be! Similarly, the more connected, capable, and contributing each student feels, will result in improved academic results.

#### 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.

Attendance recognition and incentives will be provided the class on each grade level who has the least number of absences/tardies/early dismissals & biggest reduction in the number of absences/tardies/early dismissals from the month prior.

**Person Responsible:** Cristina Fong (cristina.fong@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Beginning September 30, and every end of month through May 2024

Students will be recognized for following our Bobcat Guidelines (Be Safe, Be Respectful, Be A Learner) through:

1. Bobcat Tickets ~ weekly drawings for incentives will be held every Friday

- 2. Bobcat Students of the Month ~ medals and certificates to be provided each month
- 3. Bobcat Golden Ticket ~ to be awarded to one student in each class where there is a substitute teacher for following the Bobcat Guidelines & helping the Sub have a great day filled with lots of learning
- 4. Woo Hoo Positive Bobcat Referrals ~ to be awarded as often as any teacher/staff member wants to! The purpose is to recognize students who help each other, make improvements (behavior or academic), and make our school remain "the happiest place on earth."

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Ghettie (tracy.ghettie@palmbeachschools.org)

**By When:** Beginning August 15 after grade level SwPBS Assemblies and continuing through the last day of school.

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.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Ghettie (tracy.ghettie@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

#### #3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

#### **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.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

#### **Monitoring:**

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

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

#### **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

#### **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).

NA

# **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: Instructional Practice: ELA                            | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Select below:  | \$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