# Slam Boca School

**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Slam Boca

## 22500 HAMMOCK ST, Boca Raton, FL 33428

### slamboca.com

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/31/2023.

### 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:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years. |

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# I. School Information

## School Mission and Vision

### Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of SLAM is to provide an innovative and in-depth secondary educational program that produces college-bound students through emphasis on sports-related majors and post-secondary preparation.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to position students for future success in a global job market, equip them with the skills to pursue their passions and develop their character to make a positive impact on society.

## 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 |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| rodriguez, caridad | Principal | Ms. Rodriguez will monitor and work will all staff listed above to ensure implementation with MTSS and SIP support. The Principal oversees the execution and monitoring of all strategies and action steps towards continuous improvement process at the school. The Principal will guide and facilitate instruction with the use of best practices and school district recommended resources/materials. It is the principal's responsibility to deepen the understanding of standards and engage faculty, students, parents, and the community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college and career readiness. In addition, the principal hires and retains highly qualified employees, uses data to inform decisions and instruction, professional learning, performance, and student learning. The principal quickly and proactively addresses problems in instruction and student learning. Finally, as principal, Ms. Rodriguez must reflect on competing priorities and focus attention on those that will have the greatest leverage in improving instruction and learning. |
| Corporan, Johanna | Assistant Principal | As assistant Principal, Ms. Corporan supports professional learning and collaboration amongst teachers and resource staff and facilitates and leads professional learning focused on content, instruction, and pedagogical content knowledge. She must demonstrate through daily decisions and actions that the school's priority is academic success for every student. The Assistant Principal assists with eliminating barriers and distractions that interfere with effective teaching and learning. Supports the principal in building a culture of pride, trust, and respect. Monitors the implementation of cultural competence, equity, and access within the instructional practices at the school center. She also monitors and improves instruction by visiting classrooms to support and monitor instruction. |
| Casa, Cody | Assistant Principal | As assistant Principal, Mr. Casa supports professional learning and collaboration amongst teachers and resource staff and facilitates and leads professional learning focused on content, instruction, and pedagogical content knowledge. He must demonstrate through daily decisions and actions that the school's priority is academic success for every student. The Assistant Principal assists with eliminating barriers and distractions that interfere with effective teaching and learning. Supports the principal in building a culture of pride, trust, and respect. Monitors the implementation of cultural competence, equity, and access within the instructional practices at the school center. He also monitors and improves instruction by visiting classrooms to support and monitor instruction. |
| | Assistant Principal | As assistant Principal, Mrs. Suarez supports professional learning and collaboration amongst teachers and resource staff and facilitates and leads professional learning focused on content, instruction, and pedagogical content knowledge. She must demonstrate through daily decisions and actions that the school's priority is academic success for every student. The Assistant Principal assists with eliminating barriers and distractions that interfere with effective teaching and learning. Supports the principal in |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| | | building a culture of pride, trust, and respect. Monitors the implementation of cultural competence, equity, and access within the instructional practices at the school center. She also monitors and improves instruction by visiting classrooms to support and monitor instruction. |
| Korte, Yulisa | Instructional Coach | The Instructional Coach assists with the coordination and implementation of the District approved curriculum, which follows state standards. She utilizes the coaching model (planning, demonstrating, and providing feedback) with teachers at the school site. Provides site based professional development to staff that is aligned to the needs of students based upon student assessment data. Assists administration and the classroom teachers in the interpretation of student assessment data. Participates in professional development and shares the content with school staff.

Mrs. Korte offers support to classroom teachers in assisting with the Response to Intervention (RTI) process and ensure SIP goals are met for ELA (Reading/Writing) and Math. She will also lead standards-based planning and implements coaching cycles. |
| Elrod, Kelly | Dean | Mr. Elrod is the Dean of Discipline is a key administrative role within an educational institution. Their primary responsibility is to maintain a safe and orderly school environment by enforcing disciplinary policies and procedures. Specifically, the dean of discipline:

-Handles Disciplinary Matters
-Investigates Incidents
-Implements Discipline Strategies
-Collaborates with Staff and Parents
-Maintains Records

The role of the dean of discipline is crucial in creating a safe and conducive learning environment that fosters positive student behavior and academic achievement. They often work in close collaboration with school administrators, teachers, and other support staff to promote a culture of respect, responsibility, and accountability among students. |
| Cast, Kelley | Other | The testing coordinator plays a critical role in maintaining the integrity of the testing process and ensuring that testing procedures are conducted in a fair, consistent, and efficient manner. Their work contributes to the accurate assessment of student performance and the overall effectiveness of educational programs within our school. |

**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.

Through Parent Trainings we support families with educational workshops facilitated by our school counselors, , mobile response teams, reading and math coaches, ESOL, ESE, and the Administrative Team.

Our ESOL Coordinator works 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.

A school safety officer is on campus every day for the safety and security of all students and staff. The school has one point of entry for everyone. Fortify Florida Application is on every computer, and students are made aware of this "app" in our assemblies. The "Raptor System" is used to sign parents/visitors before they can go to a classroom, or school event on campus, and most recently

Guidance Counselors work in partnership with families and the District McKinney-Vento liaison to ensure the needs of these families and students are met. These supports are supplemental to school-wide supports for students and families. Our ESOL Coordinator works in conjunction with the District's Multicultural Department to ensure the implementation with fidelity of programs and services designed to improve the outcomes of our English Language Learners.

**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 do at our school. The SIP is updated throughout the year to ensure proper documentation of what we do. Continuous improvement 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 works towards the following student achievement goals:

• Strategic visioning and planning

• Problem identification and root cause analysis

• 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 Interim Assessments, iReady, Progress Learning, Read 180, Midterms, Semester exams, Achieve 3000, Imagine Learning, Delta Math, IXL, FAST Progress Monitoring, Florida Standard

Assessments, End of Course assessments, and, Teacher made assessments. The Unit Assessments will occur at the end of each unit of study. The FAST assessments will occur three times a year (PM's 1, 2, & 3 in English Language Arts, and Math). The FAST assessments will occur one to two times a year in Algebra I and Geometry.

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.

In addition, we closely monitor the Acceleration and the Graduation Rate of our students in grades 9-12.

The Single school culture (Academics, Behavior, Climate) Academics: Collaborative Planning Communities occur monthly per content area. Content area teachers meet with the academic coaches and administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and create standards-based learning goal scales. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed during Administrative Team meetings, Professional Development opportunities, the Instructional Leadership Team meetings, Faculty meetings, and School Advisory Council meetings.

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.

Teachers follow the scope and sequence as outlined on their Instructional Focus Calendars in their SLAM Playbook. This ensures that teachers have a concrete timeline as well as the resources to provide quality instruction on the mandated curriculum.

Employing frequent monitoring will allow us to adjust the instructional focus for remediation, remediating deficiencies before they become substantial. In addition, we will be able individualize instruction to best meet the needs of our students, thus increasing student achievement.

We strategically plan for:

· Review of Lesson Plans,

· Data Analysis,

· Classroom walks,

· Student attendance,

· Data Chats,

· Formal Observations,

· Professional Development,

· Formative/Summative Assessments.
· Supporting professional learning and improvement

**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**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>6-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 71% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 63% |
| **Charter School** | Yes |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification**<br>*updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)*<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| **School Grades History**<br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C<br><br>2019-20: B<br><br>2018-19: B |
| **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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 19 | 34 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 19 | 51 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 67 | 77 | 201 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 46 | 45 | 129 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 96 | 106 | 301 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**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 | 1 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Absent 10% or more school days | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

## 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 school days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | |

## 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* | 43 | 52 | 50 | 48 | 55 | 51 | 47 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 46 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49 | | | 44 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 45 | 38 | 38 | 40 | 42 | 38 | 40 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 48 | | | 28 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49 | | | 32 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 51 | 68 | 64 | 44 | 43 | 40 | 43 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 63 | 67 | 66 | 63 | 53 | 48 | 63 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 80 | | | 57 | 46 | 44 | 62 | | |
| Graduation Rate | 100 | 90 | 89 | | 65 | 61 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 80 | 71 | 65 | | 69 | 67 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 42 | 40 | 45 | 54 | | | 73 | | |

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 63 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 504 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | 100 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 502 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| 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 | 25 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| ELL | 40 | Yes | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | | | |
| HSP | 63 | | | |
| MUL | 54 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | | | |
| FRL | 64 | | | |

| 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 | 28 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | Yes | 2 | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |
| MUL | 53 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | | | |
| FRL | 50 | | | |

**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 | 43 | | | 45 | | | 51 | 63 | 80 | 100 | 80 | 42 |
| SWD | 17 | | | 21 | | | 24 | 36 | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 25 | | | 33 | | | 36 | 35 | 69 | | 6 | 42 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 21 | | | 20 | | | 27 | 60 | | 82 | 6 | |
| HSP | 42 | | | 48 | | | 52 | 62 | 75 | 81 | 8 | 43 |
| MUL | 71 | | | 36 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | | | 50 | | | 59 | 65 | 85 | | 6 | 39 |
| FRL | 43 | | | 41 | | | 52 | 69 | 82 | 85 | 8 | 36 |

### 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 | 48 | 50 | 49 | 40 | 48 | 49 | 44 | 63 | 57 | | | 54 |
| SWD | 16 | 31 | 28 | 17 | 41 | 44 | 17 | 29 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 51 | 47 | 26 | 47 | 47 | 18 | 50 | 10 | | | 54 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 48 | 33 | 21 | 49 | 53 | 7 | 57 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 54 | 57 | 42 | 48 | 47 | 47 | 62 | 58 | | | 61 |
| MUL | 58 | 41 | | 44 | 67 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 46 | 40 | 41 | 48 | 50 | 44 | 64 | 61 | | | 36 |
| FRL | 49 | 48 | 55 | 41 | 49 | 51 | 43 | 62 | 53 | | | 53 |

### 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 | 47 | 46 | 44 | 40 | 28 | 32 | 43 | 63 | 62 | | | 73 |
| SWD | 18 | 40 | 42 | 17 | 29 | 32 | 17 | 48 | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 57 | 66 | 33 | 34 | 45 | 29 | 35 | | | | 73 |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 26 | 29 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 23 | 55 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 47 | 39 | 44 | 30 | 38 | 44 | 65 | 67 | | | 73 |
| MUL | 60 | 57 | | 43 | 38 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 50 | 61 | 39 | 25 | 31 | 45 | 64 | 58 | | | 69 |
| FRL | 48 | 47 | 41 | 38 | 25 | 29 | 43 | 58 | 59 | | | 72 |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| | | | ELA | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 50% | -11% | 50% | -11% | |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 48% | -4% | 47% | -3% | |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 47% | -8% | 47% | -8% | |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 43% | 48% | -5% | 48% | -5% | |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 45% | -12% | 47% | -14% | |

| | | | MATH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 54% | -15% | 54% | -15% | |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 36% | 4% | 48% | -8% | |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 65% | -11% | 55% | -1% | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 25% | 46% | -21% | 44% | -19% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 48% | 3% | 50% | 1% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 50% | 0% | 48% | 2% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 70% | 63% | 7% | 63% | 7% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 65% | -3% | 66% | -4% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 62% | 0% | 63% | -1% |

# 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.**

2021-2022
ELA percentage:

Grades 6-10:
Proficiency: 47%; 1s and 2s: 52%

Math percentage:
MS: Proficiency: 40%; 1s and 2s: 61%
Algebra I: Proficiency 52%; 1s and 2s: 47%
Geometry: Proficiency 34%; 1s and 2s: 62%

Lowest 25% ELA percentage:
6th grade: 32 students
7th grade: 43 students
8th grade: 33 students
9th grade: 37 students
10th grade: 24 students
Total: 169 students

Lowest 25% Math percentage:
6th grade: 30 students
7th grade: 28 students
8th grade: 36 students
MS Total: 94 students

Algebra I: 32 students
Geometry: 33 students
HS Total: 65 students

And subgroups:
SWD: 10%
ELL: 22%
Black: 8%

Spring 2023:
ELA
6th grade: 33%
7th grade: 44%
8th grade: 39%
9th grade: 43%
10th grade: 39%

Math:
6th grade: 39%
7th grade: 40%
8th grade: 54%

Algebra 1: 51%
Geometry: 50%

From fiscal year (FY) 2022 to FY 2023, our lowest performing group was the cohort of students in the 6th to 8th grade for the subject of Mathematics.

This outcome can be attributed to several key factors. Firstly, there was a significant disparity in the curriculum as a result of the transition in standards and educational content during this period. Changes in standards often necessitate adjustments in teaching methods and materials, and it's this transition led

to a gap in the students' understanding and performance.

Moreover, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has likely exacerbated this situation. The residual academic gaps stemming from the disruptions caused by the pandemic, such as school closures, remote learning challenges, and the overall shift to virtual education, have contributed to the difficulties faced by students in comprehending and mastering the Mathematics curriculum.

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

Our lowest performing group was in the area of English Language Arts. In the spring of 2022, we observed that 47% of students in grades 6 through 10 were proficient in this subject. However, there was a concerning decline in the following year, as the proficiency rate dropped by 7%, resulting in only 40% of students demonstrating proficiency in the spring of 2023.

Several significant factors contributed to this decline. One prominent reason was the shift in standards, which inevitably impacted the way the subject was taught and assessed. The change in standards likely required an adjustment in teaching methods and curriculum content, which could have led to confusion and difficulties for both students and educators in adapting to the new requirements.

Furthermore, the transition from the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) to the Florida Assessment for Student Testing (FAST) might have posed additional challenges. Differences in the format, content, or evaluation criteria between the two tests could have caused a mismatch in preparation and expectation, potentially contributing to the decline in proficiency among students.

**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.**

The component with the greatest gap is 6th grade ELA. Our proficiency in FY 2023 was 33% and the State's proficiency was at 47% which is deficit of 14%.

Several significant factors contributed to this decline. One prominent reason was the shift in standards, which inevitably impacted the way the subject was taught and assessed. The change in standards likely required an adjustment in teaching methods and curriculum content, which could have led to confusion and difficulties for both students and educators in adapting to the new requirements.

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

Math percentage: Spring 2022
MS: Proficiency: 40%
Geometry: Proficiency 34%

Math percentage: Spring 2023
MS: Proficiency: 44%
Geometry: 50%

We provided students with a solid grounding in essential algebraic concepts and skills, allowing them to build a strong foundation before progressing to more advanced levels of mathematics. This targeted intervention aimed to address the specific needs of students who required additional support and guidance in mastering algebraic principles.

Furthermore, we offered comprehensive after-school and Saturday tutoring sessions, enabling students to receive personalized academic assistance outside regular school hours. These supplementary

learning opportunities allowed students to receive focused attention and support from educators, fostering a conducive environment for addressing individual learning challenges and enhancing their understanding of complex mathematical concepts.

Additionally, the implementation of pull-out groups during the school day, alongside the provision of intensive math classes for middle school students, further facilitated a more tailored and supportive learning experience. These initiatives were designed to provide targeted instruction and guidance to students, helping them develop a deeper understanding of mathematical concepts and improve their overall performance in the subject.

As a result of these concerted efforts, there was a notable improvement in the overall performance of students in middle school math, with the proficiency rate increasing from 40% in Spring 2022 to 44% in Spring 2023. Notably, the significant growth in the area of Geometry, with the proficiency rate rising from 34% in Spring 2022 to an impressive 50% in Spring 2023. These outcomes underscore the effectiveness of the implemented interventions in fostering academic progress and fostering a more supportive learning environment for students.

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

1. ELA academic gap increasing
2. Middle math decline scores

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. ESSA Groups SWD, BLK, ELL
3. Seniors and Juniors meeting the ELA graduation requirement
4. Seniors and Juniors meeting the Algebra I graduation requirement

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

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**

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

Teacher recruitment and retention is an area of focus within a school improvement plan for several reasons:

-Impact on Student Achievement: High-quality teachers have a significant impact on student achievement and overall school performance. Teacher recruitment and retention efforts are crucial to ensuring that students have access to competent and dedicated educators who can effectively facilitate their learning.

-Maintaining Consistency and Stability: High turnover rates can disrupt the learning environment and hinder the continuity of instruction.

-Building a Positive School Culture: Teachers play a central role in shaping the school culture and fostering a positive learning environment. A stable and content teaching staff contributes to a supportive and nurturing school culture, enhancing student engagement and overall academic success.

-Promoting Professional Development: A focus on teacher recruitment and retention can also involve the implementation of robust professional development programs. Investing in the growth and development of teachers can improve job satisfaction and motivation, leading to increased retention rates and a more skilled teaching workforce.

-Addressing Teacher Shortages: In some regions or subjects, there might be a shortage of qualified teachers. A school improvement plan focused on teacher recruitment can address this issue by implementing targeted recruitment strategies, such as offering incentives or creating partnerships with local universities to attract new educators.

-Ensuring Diversity and Inclusion: Prioritizing teacher recruitment and retention efforts can also contribute to building a diverse and inclusive teaching staff that represents the student population. A diverse faculty can provide role models for students from various backgrounds and foster a more inclusive learning environment.

By emphasizing teacher recruitment and retention within a school improvement plan, it can create a more stable, supportive, and effective learning environment for both educators and students and our subgroups (SWD, Black, and ELL) .

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

By May of 2024, SLAM Boca Raton will have retained 70% of their new recruited teachers, evidenced by teacher turn-over rate for the 2023-2024 school year. Currently, SLAM Boca has 10 newly recruited teachers in the ESP Foundations program. Our goal is by May 2024, at least 5 of the teachers will have completed the ESP Program and signed a commitment to teach at SLAM Boca in FY25.

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

-Classroom observation
-Professional Growth Plan (attendance/participation)
-PD Implementation via Classroom observations
-Monthly Check-ins

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

caridad rodriguez (crodriguez@slamboca.com)

**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.)

-Coaching Cycles (Instructional Coach)
-ESP Program/-GPS Mentorship (Giants Providing Support)
-Professional Developments
-Department Collaborative Meetings

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

-Coaching Cycles: Provide opportunities for teachers to refine their instruction.
-ESP and GPS (Giants Providing Support): Mentorship programs provide guidance and support.
-Professional Development: Equips educators with the latest teaching methodologies and resources.
-Department Collaborative Planning: Creates collaboration, where ideas and best practices are shared, leading to a cohesive and supportive school environment.

**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.

Coaching cycles allows for teacher support and provides them with guidance on how to improve. Feedback and monitoring is done on a weekly basis starting from August and goes through the end of the year.

**Person Responsible:** Yulisa Korte (ykorte@slamboca.com)

**By When:** Coaching cycles begin in September.

ESP Program and GPS Program are our mentorship programs for our new teachers in education and veteran teachers that are new to SLAM Boca. We use professional development plans to set goals and help them achieve it. We track it through attendance sheets as well.

**Person Responsible:** Johanna Corporan (jcorporan@slamboca.com)

**By When:** Mentorship programs begins in August during pre-planning week and monitored through monthly meetings.

Professional development begins in August during pre-planning week and runs all year through professional development days. Topics are chosen by needs assessments.

**Person Responsible:** Johanna Corporan (jcorporan@slamboca.com)

**By When:** Professional Development is monitored through the district professional development platform, attendance sheets and classroom observation to ensure PD strategy implementation.

Department Collaborative meetings are held monthly and have been ongoing since August and runs through May.

**Person Responsible:** caridad rodriguez (crodriguez@slamboca.com)

**By When:** Held monthly and have been ongoing since August and runs through May.

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**

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

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

Our second instructional priority is to ensure instructional practice will focus on supporting a teacher's ability to plan, implement, and assess high-quality, standards-based lessons that focus on instructional delivery practices requiring students to do the cognitive lift.

Focusing on instructional practices will help increase performance in our students and our subgroups SWD, Black, and ELLs.

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

By May 2024, SLAM Boca will increase 5% in ELA, Math, Algebra, and Geometry.

ELA 39% in Spring 2023 to 44% in Spring 2024.
Math 44% in Spring 2023 to 49% in Spring 2024.
Algebra 50% in Spring 2023 to 55% in Spring 2024.
Geometry 50% in Spring 2023 to 55% in Spring 2024.

We will increase 3% in our subgroups (SWD, Black, ELL) in learning gains in ELA, Middle School Math, Algebra and Geometry.

Teacher Practice Outcomes:
By May 2024, 80% of our teachers will effectively utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction, by ensuring specific focus on the "you do" of the model, to ensure students can independently work on tasks to demonstrate understanding of the standard.

Coaching Outcomes:
Our Assistant Principals will observe teachers to measure their implementation of the Gradual Release Model. We will rate their instruction and delivery needs improvement, effective, or highly effective.

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

We strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:

Review of Lesson Plans
Progress Learning (standards-based assessments)
Classroom walkthroughs/Formal Observations
Professional Learning Communities attendance/participation

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Johanna Corporan (jcorporan@slamboca.com)

**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.)

Planbook
Progress Learning/Data Chat Presentations
Classroom Observations
Professional Development attendance sheets and participation

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

Planbook- Gradual Release is built in our lesson plan platform and we monitor proper components to the gradual release model
Progress Learning/Data Chat Presentations (SDA - Stop Drop and Assess)- Students take standards-based tests on Progress Learning and our leadership team aggregates the data and have data chats with each teacher on the team (all tested subjects)
Gradual release during instruction and delivery/small group
Professional Development tailored to data, instruction and delivery, and best practices

**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.

Planbook is checked weekly and the gradual release and small group planning is monitored making sure it addresses state standards and assessments.

**Person Responsible:** Yulisa Korte (ykorte@slamboca.com)

**By When:** Lesson plans need to show evidence of state standards and gradual release from August through May.

Progress Learning Data is pulled by our leadership team bi-weekly and data chats are held monthly for all departments. This has been implemented from August through April.

**Person Responsible:** Kelley Cast (kcast@slamboca.com)

**By When:** August through April

Classroom observations are completed through Agavex

**Person Responsible:** Johanna Corporan (jcorporan@slamboca.com)

**By When:** Ongoing from September

Professional developments are chosen based on school needs which at this time are data and interventions, instruction and delivery, and lesson planning.

**Person Responsible:** Johanna Corporan (jcorporan@slamboca.com)

**By When:** August to April

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

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

Resources and allocations are focused on:
1. Resource teachers (ESOL and ESE) support during small group instruction.
2. Teachers and support staff will attend ongoing professional development to engage deep, focused, collaborative planning to support and strengthen data analysis and small group planning and implementation.
3. Professional Development will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies.
4. Instructional Coach will provide teachers with a variety of levels of support to ensure teacher development and growth.
5. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework to ensure students are provided with the specific instruction, resources, time, and intensity needed for success.
6. Professional Development opportunities through District offerings (eLearning). District meetings and trainings, (Literacy, Math, School Based Teams).
7. Data collection and review meetings will be scheduled monthly to determine individual school needs and provide additional training and support.
8. The District Reading Collaboration team provides professional development to schools based on needs.
9. Curriculum Resources: Curriculum resources to enhance ELA, Science, Civics & Math skills and support student mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. standards, will support literacy across the content areas, will support social emotional growth through the resources found in the Resilience learning to promote character education.
10. We have partnerships with multiple community and business partners. Together the schools, partner organizations, and businesses provide additional high-quality resources and services to students and families and comprehensively focus on health and wellness, as well as academic achievement.
11. Title IV funds are allocated towards providing instructional support in Reading.
12. A Data Analyst has been added to our team to analyze, breakdown, and implement intervention strategies.
13. Positive Behavior Intervention System: HERO is the school-wide program used to address discipline and communicate with parents to monitor, target, and correct behavior.
14. Resilience Learning through Alaia is the school-wide program which is a comprehensive program that focuses on problem solving skills, social emotional growth, and character education.