

The School District of Palm Beach County

South Olive Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

South Olive Elementary School

7101 S OLIVE AVE, West Palm Beach, FL 33405

<https://soes.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Melinda Springman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/21/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

South Olive Elementary is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equality to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement

South Olive Elementary envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Springman, Melinda	Principal	Director of SAC Leader of the School Responsible for submitting SIP after it is drafted and approved by the SAC. Monitoring and data chats Teacher Coaching
Hamerling, Dava	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Participates in drafting and approval of SIP Monitors initiatives and facilitates teacher coaching Monitors student performance to adjust professional development plans and initiatives Testing Coordinator Responsible for ESSA implementation and monitoring in SIP
Owens, Hillary	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor Implementation and monitoring of SEL component Coaching around Goal-Setting for students and staff
Chiacchio, Kathy	Other	ESE Coordinator Monitoring ESE initiatives and participates in classroom walk throughs to monitor instruction and coach Serves on leadership team to provide input and suggestions
Bell, Yiselk	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade lead Facilitates and Monitors PLCs for instruction and data interventions Serves on Leadership team to gather input from her teachers and advise principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students
Van Weddingen, Kerry	Teacher, K-12	ESOL Coordinator Monitoring ESE initiatives and participates in classroom walk throughs to monitor instruction Serves on Leadership team to gather input from her teachers and advise principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students
Murphy, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Kinder Lead Facilitates and Monitors PLCs for instruction and data interventions Serves on Leadership team to gather input from her teachers and advise principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moreland, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	4th GR Lead Facilitates and Monitors PLCs for instruction and data interventions Serves on Leadership team to gather input from her teachers and advise principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students
Nixon, Ilona	Teacher, K-12	5th GL Lead Facilitates and Monitors PLCs for instruction and data interventions Serves on Leadership team to gather input from her teachers and advise principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students
Havican, Adam	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Havican is a 2nd grade teacher who teachers a self-contained class. Facilitates and Monitors PLCs for instruction and data interventions. Serves on Leadership team to gather input from his teachers and advise principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students
Zelnick, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Lead, 1st grade. Facilitates PLCs and data chats Serves on Leadership team to gather input from her teachers and advise principal on school-wide decisions that impact instruction for all students
Sanabria, Daneen	Attendance/Social Work	Behavioral Health Professional, serves on SAC, McKinney Vento Works with families in need to make sure that basic Maslow needs are met so that students can be successful with instruction and learning

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Melinda Springman

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	62	71	85	80	102	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	17	10	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	15	30	24	40	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Course failure in Math	0	4	6	13	25	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
FY20 ELA Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	38	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
FY20 Math Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	12	16	25	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/24/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	80	94	81	110	84	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	554
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	12	5	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	26	16	48	31	24	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	8	5	10	22	18	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	80	94	81	110	84	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	554
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	12	5	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	26	16	48	31	24	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	8	5	10	22	18	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	68%	58%	57%	63%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	63%	58%	58%	61%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	56%	53%	42%	56%	48%
Math Achievement	70%	68%	63%	66%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains	64%	68%	62%	57%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	59%	51%	48%	53%	47%
Science Achievement	52%	51%	53%	64%	56%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	54%	12%	58%	8%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	62%	10%	58%	14%
	2018	65%	58%	7%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	62%	59%	3%	56%	6%
	2018	51%	59%	-8%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	65%	9%	62%	12%
	2018	68%	63%	5%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	67%	-5%	64%	-2%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	65%	5%	60%	10%
	2018	62%	66%	-4%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	51%	-1%	53%	-3%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	47	38	42	58	40	10				
ELL	50	59	55	54	68	57	28				
ASN	70			70							
BLK	33	53		50	67						
HSP	63	64	51	62	68	53	43				
WHT	82	63	55	84	58		71				
FRL	57	62	47	61	64	59	37				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	31	38	30	31	38	32					
ELL	40	53	42	39	49	50	25				
BLK	60	60		47	20						
HSP	54	54	39	56	56	50	60				
WHT	74	66		83	65	50	69				
FRL	55	56	43	56	57	51	54				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	62

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
-----------------------------	--

Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Our lowest performance on diagnostics for FY21 students was in third grade math, meaning our current fourth graders. On the mid-year diagnostic, 61.62% of the students in third grade scored on level in ELA. This grade level also had the largest number of students receiving a Needs Development at the trimester report card for both ELA and Math. While this group saw a double digit improvement in performance compared to their 2018 results in third grade, it is still concerning. This group holds a larger percentage of ESE students than the other grade levels, in addition to a large ESOL population. This indicates a need to focus on strategies for the general education classrooms throughout the day, not only when ESE or ESOL teachers are pushing into the room for service.

Utilizing FY19 Data, 52% of all 5th grade students scored a level 3 or higher on the Science FCAT in FY19, which is a decline by 12% from the previous years performance. Only 10% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) scored a level 3 or higher on the Science FCAT. Minutes per day in Science were decreased in FY19 to increase time spent on

Mathematics. Another contributing factor could be that SWD may be pulled to small groups with ESE teachers during science instruction. Since SWD declined in their ELA achievement in FY19, students ability to read and comprehend could affect their performance on the Science FCAT. This was the first significant drop in Science results in five years.

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

Utilizing FY20 Data regarding mid-year diagnostics, 5th grade Mathematics saw the largest decline, with a drop from 65.69% during their 4th grade year to 59.6% proficient on diags during their 5th grade year. Successmaker results in January of FY20 indicated that 5th grade students were making appropriate gains going into the diagnostics and contradicted the diagnostic results. While these students no longer attend our school, it is important that we look into the strategies utilized in 5th grade surrounding the testing environment and preparation for FSA formatted questions, to determine whether these factors could have influenced the diagnostics.

FY19 Data, Lang Arts: Students with Disabilities

Of our ten female students with disabilities in FY19, 33.3% less earned a level 3 or higher on the FSA compared to FY18 students with disabilities.

Of our eighteen male students with disabilities in FY 19, 18.5% less earned a level 3 or higher on the FSA compared to FY18 male students with disabilities.

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

FY20 results do not provide a state average, since our data points came from district diagnostics and iReady, neither of which are statewide.

Utilizing FY19 data, both ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (Learning Gains) and Science Achievement have a one percent gap between the school and state performance (52% SOE vs. 53% State of FL). While SOE saw a 10% increase in the percentage of L25 students making learning gains in ELA, this still falls short of the state percentage by 1% and the district percentage by 4%. L25 Learning Gains for ELA has been one of the lowest performing data components on our school report card since FY17. Factors that contributed to this gap are a need for professional development on targeted small group instruction in ELA and Science, with an emphasis on strategies for struggling readers and second language learners.

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

Our most improved data component from FY20 was the fact that every subgroup saw an increase in percentage of students proficient when comparing FY19 diagnostics to FY20 diagnostics for ELA. Our work with goal-setting for individual students and individualized teacher data chats was a major contributing factor to a culture of success and student-driven motivation.

Our most improved data component from FY19 was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (Gains) with a 10% improvement. In FY19 and FY20, every teacher participated in multiple data discussions with goal setting throughout the year, with student participating in selecting and monitoring their own goals.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Concern 1: Performance of Students with Disabilities in ELA, FY19 results show only 29% of SWD earned a Level 3+, and only 47% made learning gains; only 28% of L25 (Lowest 25th percentile) made learning gains. While FY20 diagnostics showed a 12% increase in performance for ELA and a 7/1% increase in performance for Math, our Students with Disabilities remain a top priority for FY21.

Concern 2: Performance of 5th grade students on the State Science Assessment, FY19 results show 52% of students earned a Level 3+, with only 10% of SWD and 28% of ELL earning a Level 3+. While we do not have Science results from FY20, our 5th grade ELA diagnostics can show a correlation. Based on this, our 4th graders had 72.5% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations on the mid-year diag. While this shows positive possibilities for FY21, 5th grade Science will remain a priority for FY21.

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

1. Language Arts: Students with Disabilities (FY19 Achievement 29%, 47% made learning gains, 38% of L25% made learning gains). Ensure learning gains & progress for ESSA categories sub group (SWD). FY20 ELA Diagnostics indicated 34% of those students scoring a Lvl 3+. This continues to be our top priority. The plan outlines our action steps for meeting with ESE and homeroom teachers, as well as ESE students around goal-setting, selecting strategies, and monitoring progress.
2. Language Arts: Lowest 25th Percentile (FY19 52% made learning gains). Ensure learning gains & progress for our students achieving in the lowest 25% quartile. Learning Gains unavailable for FY20. Students in the L25 will have specific action plans, by teacher, to be discussed and monitored every two months at minimum.
3. Science: All Students (FY19 52% Achievement, 10% SWD Achievement). Ensure all subgroups see a significant increase in achievement in comparison to FY19. We have invested in PD and resources for 5th grade Science that we continue to implement and utilize.
4. Mathematics: Lowest 25th Percentile (FY19 52% Achievement). Ensure learning gains & progress for our students achieving in the lowest 25% quartile. Learning Gains unavailable for FY20. Goal setting, monitoring, and data chats are in place for this group. Additionally, tutoring funds have been set aside for both Math and ELA this year.
5. 3rd Grade Language Arts: (FY19 55% Proficiency) Ensure minimum of 5% improvement in proficiency. District goal of 75% proficient in 3rd grade. FY20 results showed 63.81% of our 3rd graders scored proficient on the mid-year diagnostic for ELA. Goal setting, monitoring, and data chats are in place for this group. Additionally, tutoring funds have been set aside for both Math and ELA this year. 3rd grade teachers will receive additional coaching from our ESOL Instructional Specialist this year as well.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

To ensure effective and targeted instruction for success of all students in English Language Arts in alignment with District LTO 1: Increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade to 75% in FY21.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

When reviewing our school data, we see that our lowest subgroup performance is within ELA performance. ESSA identified students with disabilities as an area for Targeted Support & Intervention. Reading provides a direct correlation to performance in other content areas as well, including Science - another one of our areas of low performance.

While FY19 showed a 10% improvement in learning gains for our lowest 25th percentile, 38 of FY20 4th graders scored a Level 1 or 2 on their mid-year diagnostic in English Language Arts. With only 75 5th graders in FY21, this data indicates a need for targeted interventions in grade 5 as well.

Long Term Objective #1: Increase ELA achievement for all students in grades 3, 4, and 5 from 68% in FY19 to 75% in FY21.

Measureable Outcome:

Our targeted goal for ESSA subgroup of SWD to improve from 40% of students demonstrating proficiency in ELA for FY19 to 50% demonstrating proficiency in ELA for FY21.

Our targeted goal for 3rd grade is to improve proficiency in ELA from 66% in FY19 to 75% in FY21.

Our targeted goal for our L25 students is to increase learning gains in ELA from 52% in FY19 to 60% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melinda Springman (melinda.springman@palmbeachschools.org)

Strategic Initiative #3 - Provide instructional programming customized to the individual strengths, needs, interest, and aspirations of each learner.

Administration will work with teacher teams to quickly identify students who are in need of supplemental and intensive intervention. Data will be taken during the first four weeks of intervention to determine whether any students need to be referred to School Based Team.

Evidence-based Strategy:

After each iReady diagnostic, administration will hold data dives with teachers regarding all students, with a specific focused action plan for L25 students.

Additional staffing will be provided to the second grade team during intervention times to decrease the number of students per intervention group. During distance learning and/or blended distance learning, enrichment activities will be posted in Google Classrooms to allow additional staffing for supplemental time.

Promote and celebrate reading through school-wide initiatives hosted through Media Center.

iReady is a district-approved evidence-based program from which teachers will pull lessons to utilize during intervention time in grades K-3.

Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) is a district-approved evidence-based program from which we will pull probes to determine whether interventions are successful.

Reduction in teacher:student ratio is a proven strategy for success with individualized attention to student needs.

Increased reading time holds a direct correlation to vocabulary and ELA scores. Promoting a culture of reading will yield increased excitement for and engagement in reading.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilizing the Palm Beach County Decision Tree for intervention, administration will meet with teacher teams to identify students in need of supplemental and intensive reading interventions within the first two weeks of school.
2. Teachers will begin strategic intervention groups by week four of school, utilizing the iReady Toolkit for interventions.
3. Teachers will collect data on each lesson and administer two probes for progress during the first four weeks.
4. Administration will meet with teacher teams at the end of the fourth week of intervention to determine which students should be referred to School Based Team (SBT).
5. Administration will meet with all core content teachers for a one-on-one data dive into student performance to create action plans for L25 students. This will be conducted three times per year.

Person Responsible Dava Hamerling (dava.hamerling@palmbeachschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: South Olive Elementary has been identified as a school with targeted support and improvement based on the results for our Students with Disabilities (SWD). Schools who have a subgroup perform below 41% on a testing component receive this designation. School data for Language Arts indicates that only 29% of our SWD achieved a level 3+ and only 38% of our SWD in the Lowest 25th (L25) Percentile achieved learning gains. School data for Mathematics indicates that only 40% of our L25 SWD achieved learning gains.

By focusing both the homeroom and exceptional student education (ESE) teachers on action plans for students with disabilities in our L25, we will close the achievement gap for our SWD students. This area of focus aligns with the District's Strategic Plan to ensure shared commitment and collective responsibility for the academic success of every student.

Measureable Outcome: Targeted Support & Improvement: Increase learning gains of L25 Students with Disabilities to 50% for both ELA and Math contents.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dava Hamerling (dava.hamerling@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strategic Initiative #3 - Provide instructional programming customized to the individual strengths, needs, interest, and aspirations of each learner.

Utilizing a framework provided in The Four Disciplines of Execution, administration will meet with teacher teams to determine both lead and lag measures related to students with disabilities in our lowest 25th percentile to monitor the effectiveness of intervention strategies and adjust action plans accordingly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Four Disciplines of Execution provides an excellent framework for a) drilling down to the root cause of problems and b) creating a system for monitoring the success of a program to adjust practices accordingly.

These research based strategies are approved and utilized by senior leadership in The School District of Palm Beach County.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilizing Successmaker, Reading Running Record data, former iReady data, and FSA results, administration will meet with teacher teams to determine which students with disabilities are performing in our lowest 25th percentile for both ELA and Mathematics prior to the first progress report.
2. Utilizing the framework to drill down to root causes, administration will meet with these same teacher teams to determine the root causes of the achievement gaps prior to the end of September.
3. Utilizing the framework to monitor lag and lead measures, administration will create a monitoring system to be utilized frequently (minimum of once per grading period - every six weeks).
4. At these monitoring meetings, administration will work with teacher teams to adjust action plans accordingly, based on lead measures.

Person Responsible Dava Hamerling (dava.hamerling@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

A. Increase achievement results in Science from 52% Level 3+ in FY19 to 64% Level 3+ in FY21.

(a) 5th grade science teachers will meet with administration and data support specialist to discuss students' progress in science at a minimum of two times per semester.

(b) STEM teachers are provided guidelines for minutes of Science vs. Math on a weekly basis, with a minimum of 150 minutes per week as the expectation for Science.

(c) J&J Bootcamp resources have been purchased to supplement the district provided curriculum with additional review and practice opportunities.

(d) Professional Development will be provided to 5th grade Science teachers in district expectations and J&J Bootcamp materials.

(e) We will explore opportunities for collaboration with local community partners for the benefit of our Science Program, including but not limited to the computer sciences.

B. Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:

(a) History of Holocaust

(b) History African Americans

(c) Hispanic Contributions to the United States

(d) Women's Contributions to the United States

(e) Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients have made in serving our country and protecting democratic values worldwide.

Additional content required for instruction by Florida Statute 1003.42(2), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, include:

- Declaration of Independence
- Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights
- Federalist papers: Republican form of government
- Flag education
- Civil government: functions and interrelationships
- History of the United States
- Principles of Agriculture
- Effects of alcohol and narcotics
- Kindness to animals
- Florida history
- Conservation of natural resources
- Health education
- Free enterprise
- Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.

C. Our school will promote and celebrate our School Advisory Council's collaboration with the school community, required by S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii),

(a) We will seek a balanced representation of our school community.

(b) The SAC will continually discuss, refer to, and guide The School Improvement Plan, focused on student achievement.

(c) We will continue to recognize and appreciate the wonderful multicultural diversity of South Olive ES through special events, culturally relevant curriculum, and by promoting a Single School Culture of excellence

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At South Olive Elementary we are Ohana. Ohana means family. Family means nobody gets left behind or forgotten. We are constantly striving to live up to this motto and to create a positive school culture and environment. Our School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SwPBS) work tirelessly to ensure that there is a positive climate for students, faculty and staff. At South Olive we have the "PAWS" system in place to demonstrate school wide expectations. PAWS stands for:

Practice Kindness

Act Safely

Work Together

Show Respect

Our PAWS matrix is posted in classrooms and throughout the building. Students are expressly taught by their teachers to use and refer to our PAWS matrix. Our matrix covers all settings and situations on campus including the hallways, Cafeteria, bathrooms, playground, computer labs, as well as virtual learning.

Our SwPBS committee also makes sure our teachers and students are celebrated. Classes have a chance to earn positive behavior notes in the form of a paper "PAW" that are displayed on a huge bulletin board in the hallway for all to see. At the end of each trimester, one class one each grade level is celebrated with a special treat, party, or extra recess time. Also, each week teachers are asked to fill out positive office referrals for a student in their classroom. Students who are referred are called to the office where their referral is read aloud, they are given a treat and if possible student pictures are posted on Twitter. Another way we celebrate students is when they reach a goal whether it is academic or behaviorally, they can "ring the bell" in the front office. Students are asked to come down in the morning to ring the bell with the assistant principal. The student states the goal they meet, ring a rather large bell for the entire office and most of the front hall to hear! Their picture is taken and it is placed on a bulletin board for all to see. Each month, our school counselor gives out Character Counts Awards, teachers nominate a student who exemplifies the monthly characteristic. A small ceremony is held honoring the student from each class and one student is chosen randomly each month to win a bicycle. Students are also celebrated with a picture to Twitter when they are "Caught being Kind". For all our hard work in the last couple of years, South Olive was recognized as a Gold Level Tier 1 Model PBIS school for the 2019-2020 school year by the Florida BPIS Project.

In addition to SwPBS, South Olive ensures all stakeholders are involved through a strong

Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) and School Advisory Committee (SAC), which are both led by parents of students at the school and involve teachers, administration, and parents working together. Our PTO Executive Board is comprised of a dedicated group of parents who have remain involved for years. This year, in particular, our PTO has decided to make PTO membership FREE to all families to guarantee all benefit.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$602.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	0572 - South Olive Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	546.99	\$602.00
			<i>Notes: SAC approved School Improvement funds to be utilized for fund tutoring after school to increase ELA proficiency.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$602.00