

The School District of Palm Beach County

University Preparatory Academy Palm Beach School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

University Preparatory Academy Palm Beach

2101 N. AUSTRALIAN AVE, West Palm Beach, FL 33407

upaflorida.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/18/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of University Preparatory Academy-Palm Beach is to provide students with the academic, leadership and social skills that will enable them to attend and graduate from an institution of higher education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of University Preparatory Academy is to provide historically underserved communities with access to a college preparatory experience at the K-8 level.

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
Hill, Michael	Principal	<p>Deepens understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college- and career-readiness.</p>
		<p>Meets one-on-one, in teams, and as a whole faculty to reinforce high expectations for students and staff, develop plans to achieve the visions and standards, review with evidence progress toward the goals, and identify exemplars of the vision in action and barriers to it. Demonstrates through daily decisions and actions that the school's priority is academic success for every student. Monitors the implementation of effective instruction to meet the needs of all students. Be present in classrooms and learning communities frequently to lend support to teachers and keeps abreast of their professional learning and instructional needs. Provides a clean, safe and nurturing school environment.</p>
		<p>Focuses the administrative and school leadership teams' work on implementation of standards and reformed instruction. Sets expectations for staff for engaging with teacher leaders in ongoing efforts to improve instruction and student learning. Develops deep understanding of standards and requisite classroom curriculum and instruction to achieve the standards. Sets clear goals with individuals, teams, and the whole faculty for student achievement and effective instruction aligned with the vision for academic success aligned to the new standards.</p>
		<p>Hires and retains highly qualified and effective employees. Taps the expertise of teachers who have solved persistent instructional problems and supports sharing of these practices and ongoing inquiry among staff. Uses data to inform decisions and instruction, professional learning, performance, and student learning. Supervises and evaluates all school-based personnel, including conducting performance appraisal sessions which are extensions of a Board-approved personnel assessment system, making reappointment recommendations and providing staff development/training opportunities.</p>
		<p>Manages and supervises the school's financial resources, including the preparation of the school's budget, the monitoring of internal accounts, and the review and approval of purchases and payments for all goods and services received.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stokes, Lashay	Instructional Coach	<p>Facilitate the intellectual and processional development of teachers. Communicate and demonstrate research-based instructional practices that result in increased student performance and improved classroom environment.</p> <p>Encourage professional growth and provide organized, individual and/or group learning opportunities for teachers. Assist teachers with designing instructional decisions based on assessment data and culturally responsive practices. Assist teachers in creating materials that are in alignment with curriculum. Instruct and support teachers with curriculum software products, and classroom/curriculum related technologies. Provide support in analyzing student assessment data.</p> <p>Support, implement and assess various instructional programs and program effects on student achievement. Participates in goal/plan setting and evaluation.</p>
Diaz, Nicole	Teacher, ESE	<p>The ESE Staffing Coordinator is responsible for scheduling and conducting change of placements, eligibility staffing's, and Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Interpreting programs and placements to parents. * Assisting with the District, State and Federal record reviews. * Monitoring the District's compliance with rules and regulations.

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.

School data is shared through various formal and informal opportunities such as Comprehensive Needs Assessments, parent meetings, staff meetings, and other informal meetings with school leaders. During these meetings, the school's data, successes, and challenges are shared and feedback is gathered to assist school leadership in making improvements and adjustments to school programs and operations.

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))

School progress is monitored during bi-monthly leadership meetings and weekly individual meetings with the school leadership team. During these meetings various components of the school operations, instructional programs are evaluated along with monitoring of the school's academic data. The meetings include the principal who shares a broad overview of school progress; a reading instructional coach who provides feedback on the progress and impact of reading instruction; a math instructional coach who provides feedback on the progress and impact of math instruction; an ESE coordinator who provides

feedback on the progress and impact of ESE services and intervention data; and the school mental health professional who provides input on student well-being.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	2	1	1	2	0	2	0	1	9	
One or more suspensions	3	1	2	4	6	2	12	7	9	46	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	10	4	9	18	7	9	22	7	7	93	
Course failure in Math	9	7	13	8	4	8	27	23	17	116	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	24	10	19	17	11	91	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	23	10	21	18	12	95	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	25	31	20	28	16	8	128	

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	3	2	3	6	4	2	12	17	9	58

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	1	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										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	11	30	15	4	5	91	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	13	35	25	7	2	100	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	5	27	13	9	29	19	20	122	

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	1	3	3	0	10	20	14	8	59

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	2	7	4	3	7	10	5	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	11	30	15	4	5	91	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	13	35	25	7	2	100	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	5	27	13	9	29	19	20	122	

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	1	3	3	0	10	20	14	8	59

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	2	7	4	3	7	10	5	38
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*	25	49	53	28	52	55	23		
ELA Learning Gains				47			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			47		
Math Achievement*	26	51	55	29	45	42	25		
Math Learning Gains				49			9		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			6		
Science Achievement*	14	46	52	15	48	54	5		
Social Studies Achievement*	20	63	68	29	57	59	62		
Middle School Acceleration		68	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate		73	74		38	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		62	70			
ELP Progress		53	55		64	70			

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	22
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	112
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	20	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	22	Yes	2	1
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	22	Yes	2	1

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	24	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	25			26			14	20				
SWD	20			20							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			25			13	21			5	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	24			26			13	21			5	

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	28	47	58	29	49	52	15	29				
SWD	9	31		18	38							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	27	47	59	29	49	46	16	29				
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	28	47	59	30	50	53	15	29				

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	23	38	47	25	9	6	5	62				
SWD	16			20								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	38	47	25	9	6	5	62				
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	23	38	47	24	10	6	6	62				

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	56%	-15%	54%	-13%
07	2023 - Spring	19%	48%	-29%	47%	-28%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	24%	47%	-23%	47%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	16%	58%	-42%	58%	-42%
06	2023 - Spring	26%	45%	-19%	47%	-21%
03	2023 - Spring	26%	48%	-22%	50%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	24%	54%	-30%	54%	-30%
07	2023 - Spring	19%	36%	-17%	48%	-29%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	57%	-16%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	19%	52%	-33%	61%	-42%
08	2023 - Spring	29%	65%	-36%	55%	-26%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	56%	-9%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	15%	46%	-31%	44%	-29%
05	2023 - Spring	12%	51%	-39%	51%	-39%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	65%	-46%	66%	-47%

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.

FAST Math PM1 Level 1 was 85% and decreased to 48% on FAST PM3. While the data indicates growth, math and particularly middle grades (6th-8th) math significantly lags in growth and overall proficiency.

FAST Reading PM1 Level was 69% and decreased to 47% on FAST PM3. Reading data indicates growth, but still lagging in overall student proficiency especially in 4th grade, and middle grades.

The major factors contributing to the lack of proficiency are teacher efficacy and students being deficient by multiple grade levels prior to entering the current grade. Additional teacher and student support in math and reading are needed.

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

Middle school math and ELA showed the greatest decline in overall student performance compared to the previous year. The major contributing factors were teacher efficacy and student deficiencies prior to entering the grade levels. Discipline data also indicates that while behavior improved, it continued to be a challenge for middle school classes. Overall suspensions and disciplinary infractions went down; however, the school is still supporting teachers with decreasing the number of classroom disruptions and strengthening the structure of classroom instruction.

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 FAST ELA proficiency level for UPA was 17.9%; the State of Florida was at 50%. The FAST Math proficiency level for UPA was 17.9%; the State of Florida was at 53%. The primary contributing factors for the GAP can be noted in the demographic data for the school. UPA has a 99% economically disadvantaged student population, which has shown to be a contributing factor to student performance. Additionally, teachers continue to be challenged with meeting the needs of the population and the students demonstrate learning deficiencies prior to entering grade level.

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

The most improved area of performance was in discipline. From SY22 to SY23, the overall number of incidents reported decreased by 43%. This data was corroborated by stakeholder feedback. The new actions taken by the school was the implementation of a new school culture model that provided a structured, research-based paradigm for school culture and improvement.

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

Two areas of concern are math and reading.

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

Math instruction and relative student performance.
 Reading instruction and relative student performance.
 School culture.
 Student engagement.
 Leadership performance.

Area of Focus

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

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

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

Student discipline data and staff feedback were reviewed to determine Positive Culture and Environment as an area of focus specifically relating to student engagement. Based on student data, students are demonstrating some learning gains over the course of the school year however, reaching proficiency will require growth that outpaces prior school years' learning growth. Overall 70.2% of tested students were below grade level in Math and 74.6% of students were below grade level in Reading. Given this deficiency, all parties including teachers, parents and students must function at top capacity to overcome the deficit.

Focusing on a positive culture and environment as it relates to student gains will allow greater focus to be placed on student engagement with their school and taking responsibility for their own learning. As students take additional responsibility for their learning it will improve overall student engagement and subsequent performance. Student engagement will be increased by: requiring school-wide, student-led conferences; expanding student leadership development; increase student-led school events; and embedding expectations for leadership and resiliency into the daily practices of the school via Leader In Me curriculum.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will increase the number of students demonstrating proficiency in Math from 29.8% to 40% by spring PM3 assessment. The school will increase the number of students demonstrating proficiency in Reading from 26.4% to 40% by Spring PM3 assessment. The school will increase the number of students demonstrating learning gains (moving from initial level of performance up one or more levels of performance) to 60% from Fall PM1 assessment to Spring PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

School will utilize progress monitoring data, adaptive learning data, and student/parent survey results to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Hill (michael.hill@pbcharterschools.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.)

Implementation of Leader in Me curriculum and practices. This program provides a paradigm for teachers, students, and families to develop both personally and professionally. The paradigm uniquely focuses on school growth by focusing on the areas of academics, school culture, and leadership.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The school began implementing the program during the 22-23 school year with noted improvements in student behavior and teacher satisfaction. It is expected that a full implementation of the program will increase results and improve student learning outcomes.

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.

Provide all teachers and students with access to curricula. Initiated and carry out weekly accountability meetings. Gather, analyze, and use various sources of school data on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Michael Hill (michael.hill@pbcharterschools.org)

By When: September 2023

#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.

Overall, 70.2% of tested students were below grade level in Math and 74.6% of students were below grade level in Reading at the end of the 22-23 school year based on F.A.S.T assessment data. The number of students below grade level indicates a need to focus on the area of benchmark-aligned instruction.

When instruction, assessments, and learning activities are aligned to benchmarks, it increases the likelihood that student performance will be reflected in benchmark-aligned assessment data such as the F.A.S.T assessment. Additionally, by improving instruction, assessments, and learning activities while also improving student learning outcomes, it will increase the chance that students will perform adequately on state-wide assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will increase the number of students demonstrating proficiency in Math from 29.8% to 40% by spring PM3 assessment. The school will increase the number of students demonstrating proficiency in Reading from 26.4% to 40% by Spring PM3 assessment. The school will increase the number of students demonstrating learning gains (moving from initial level of performance up one or more levels of performance) to 60% from Fall PM1 assessment to Spring PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

School will utilize progress monitoring data, adaptive learning data, and student/parent survey results to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Hill (michael.hill@pbcharterschools.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.)

Reading and math instructional coaches to provide individualized and group support for teachers in math and reading. An intensive reading teacher will provide support for K-8 students with reading deficiencies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of reading and math instructional coaches will provide stronger, direct, individualized teacher support via professional development, enhancement of professional learning communities (PLCs), providing timely and effective feedback, providing curriculum coaching, and overseeing subject area instructional programs. Additionally, the school has seen improved results through the use of instructional coaches. During the 22-23 school year, teachers that received the most support from instructional coaches demonstrated the highest learning outcomes for students. In 3rd Grade Reading, PM1 F.A.S.T data showed 79.4% of students at level 1; PM3 F.A.S.T data showed that number decreased to 32.4%. In Math, 90% of students performed at Level 1 according to PM1 progress data; by PM3, the number of students at level 1 decreased to 29.4%.

An intensive reading teacher was shown to have some impact on student reading performance during SY23. Adaptive learning data showed 40% of students improved reading performance during the year.

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?

Yes

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.

Determine and communicate instructional goals, areas of focus, and expected learning outcomes with

Person Responsible: Michael Hill (michael.hill@pbcharterschools.org)

By When: September 2023

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).

The school conducts and annual comprehensive needs assessment which allows the school to gather feedback from various stakeholders related to identified needs of the school. During the needs assessment, relevant school data is shared and compared to the identified needs provided by stakeholders. The school then prioritizes those needs for determining which areas to allocate funds to. Once the funds are allocated, the school reviews measurable outcome data to determine if the allocation fulfilled its intended outcome. If an outcome is not met, further analysis is conducted to triangulate data, review additional feedback, and determine if a new action or intervention is needed.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

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

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

NA

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

NA

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

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$126,350.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	390	4080 - University Preparatory Academy Palm Beach	UniSIG	1.0	\$63,650.00
			Notes: Math coach - Providing curriculum support for teachers. Ensuring teachers are using best practices to ensure academic growth from student achievement. 1.0 FTE x \$63,650 = \$63,650. SDPBC Code 397 - Charter School Reimbursement.			
	5100	390	4080 - University Preparatory Academy Palm Beach	UniSIG	1.0	\$49,630.00
			Notes: Intensive Reading Teacher to provide intensive reading support for K-8 students. Push-in/Pull-out support for our lowest 25% students as well as any student that has shown any reading deficiency. Students are chosen based of FY23 PM3, FY24 PM1 and iReady data. 1.0 FTE x \$49,630= \$49,630. SDPBC Code 397 - Charter School Reimbursement.			
	5100	390	4080 - University Preparatory Academy Palm Beach	UniSIG		\$4,869.00
			Notes: Benefits for Math Coach: \$63,650 * 7.65% benefits = \$4,869. SDPBC Code 397 - Charter School Reimbursement.			

	5100	390	4080 - University Preparatory Academy Palm Beach	UniSIG		\$3,797.00
			<i>Notes: Benefits for Reading Teacher: \$49,630 * 7.65% benefits = \$3,797. SDPBC Code 397 - Charter School Reimbursement.</i>			
	5100	390	4080 - University Preparatory Academy Palm Beach	UniSIG		\$4,152.46
			<i>Notes: Mobile Devices: Laptops to assist with 1:1 computer-to-student ratio in the math and science lab. 13 x \$319.42 = \$4,152.46. SDPBC Code 397 - Charter School Reimbursement.</i>			
	5100	390	4080 - University Preparatory Academy Palm Beach	UniSIG		\$251.54
			<i>Notes: Instructional Supplies: Paper, pens, pencils, notepads. Total: \$251.54. SDPBC Code 397 - Charter School Reimbursement.</i>			
Total:						\$126,350.00

Budget Approval

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

No