

Broward County Public Schools

Northeast High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Northeast High School

700 NE 56TH ST, Oakland Park, FL 33334

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Valachovic

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: D (40%) 2014-15: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Northeast High School

700 NE 56TH ST, Oakland Park, FL 33334

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

We will foster a safe environment for individual students to acquire life skills, both intellectual and personal, which will enable them to become self-directed learners both now and in the future. The expectation is for students to gain academic knowledge while cultivating the abilities necessary to evolve into a responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will have a peaceful, productive, and orderly learning environment that meets the academic, social, and developmental needs of all of our students. Our goal is to provide the highest quality programs that prepare students for a successful high school experience without the need for remediation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Valachovic, Anthony	Principal	Provides the leadership and management necessary to administer and supervise all programs, policies, and activities of the school to ensure high-quality educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment.
Boltz, Lora	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assists the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources. 2. Oversees the master schedule. 3. Leads the Math and World Language departments. 4. Oversees twelfth-grade discipline. 5. Oversees the Guidance department (including ESOL Coordinator). 6. Oversees the Magnet department. 7. Community school liaison. 8. Oversees acceleration through advanced level courses.
Fisher, Keith	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assists the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources. 2. Leads the social studies, fine arts, and physical education departments. 3. Oversees all physical plant operations, including facility maintenance. 4. Oversees transportation at the school level. 5. Oversees tenth-grade discipline. 6. Oversees acceleration through industry certification. 7. Leads the safety team and oversees the creation of the school safety plan.
Pacella, Casey	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assists the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources. 2. Leads the English and ESE departments. 3. Oversees all clericals and para-professionals. 4. District PASL leadership member. 5. Oversees all school-related activities except for athletics. 6. Oversees ninth-grade discipline. 7. Oversees graduation preparations and ceremonies.
Thompson, Allan	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assists the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources. 2. Leads the Science, Business, and AFJROTC departments. 3. Oversees eleventh-grade discipline. 4. Oversees athletics. 5. Oversees food services. 6. Oversees the security team. 7. Oversees technology including property and inventory. 8. Oversees state-mandated testing.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Erie, Brenda	School Counselor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manages the guidance department, including BRACE and ESOL coordinators. 2. Member of the curriculum council. 3. Manages and maintains the school FACE plan. 4. Oversees the development of the school counseling plan. 5. Oversees RtI/MTSS development and implementation. 6. As a SAC member, participates in the development of the district and state SIP.
Flanagan, Carolyn	Instructional Coach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Works with students, parents, school staff, guidance counselors, and District Core Curriculum administrators to ensure that site reading literacy initiatives align with District and State initiatives for high-quality instruction and student achievement. 2. Assist with improving and sustaining student achievement through literacy. 3. Enhance and refine literacy instruction and interventions. 4. Provide targeted instructional coaching and build capacity for literacy across the curriculum. 5. Develops the 9-12 Comprehensive reading plan. 6. Member of the curriculum council. 7. Oversees the implementation of the FAIR tool. 8. Co-department chair for the English department.
Hinkson, Ruth	Teacher, ESE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manages the ESE department. 2. Oversees ESE scheduling. 3. Conducts IEP meetings. 4. Serves as a liaison between parents and district support services. 5. Member of the curriculum council. 6. As a SAC member, participates in the development of the district and state SIP.
Bacigalupi, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaches Biology, Biotech, and AICE Environmental Management. 2. Science department head. 3. As a SAC member, participates in the development of the district and state SIP. 4. Assists with testing schedules and preparations. 5. Sponsors the FFEA club.
Beavers, Lecorey	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaches Personal Financial Literacy and US Government and Economics. 2. Social Studies department head. 3. As a SAC member, participates in the development of the district and state SIP. 4. Organizes underclassmen awards ceremony. 5. Oversees the "Start With Hello" campaign. 6. Member of the curriculum council. 7. Mentors teachers as a Master Teacher.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Manchester, Randolph	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Co-department head for Mathematics. 2. Teaches computer programming and Algebra 2. 3. As a SAC member, participates in the development of the district and state SIP. 4. BTU representative. 5. Member of curriculum council.
Flinn, Randa	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinates all magnet themes and programs. 2. Manages all magnet related scheduling and discipline. 3. Promotes magnet programs within feeder schools. 4. As a SAC member, participates in the development of the district and state SIP. 5. Member of curriculum council.
Mora, Fernando	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaches Spanish (regular, honors, and AICE level). 2. World Language department head. 3. Member of curriculum council. 4. Oversees the Spanish club.
Pickett, Leslie	SAC Member	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaches English Language Arts. 2. PASL coordinator 3. Assists the ESOL coordinator to conduct WIDA assessments. 4. SAC Chair: prepares and controls SAC meetings and participates in the development of the district and state SIP. 5. Member of curriculum council.
Rivera, Rafael	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AP Designee for the ninth-grade, English and ESE departments. 2. As a SAC member, participates in the development of the district and state SIP. 3. Member of curriculum council. 4. Oversees local aspiring leaders. 5. Manages exam ordering for advanced level courses. 6. Schedules, prepares, and manages all state-mandated assessments.
Berkley, Patrick	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaches English Language Arts. 2. Co-department chair for the English department. 3. As a SAC member, participates in the development of the district and state SIP. 4. Member of curriculum council. 5. Mentors teachers as a Master Teacher.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	421	439	447	413	1720
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	60	80	77	267
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	34	29	71	179
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	121	249	278	753
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	227	249	278	938

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	111	100	71	380

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	23	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	9	16	22	62

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

82

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/7/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	22	21	19	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	3	2	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	37	36	17	125
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	51	70	71	242

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	35	28	17	112

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	37%	57%	56%	38%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	39%	52%	51%	43%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	45%	42%	33%	43%	41%
Math Achievement	28%	51%	51%	30%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	31%	44%	48%	28%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	43%	45%	25%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	54%	66%	68%	57%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	52%	71%	73%	46%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	421 (0)	439 (0)	447 (0)	413 (0)	1720 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	50 ()	60 ()	80 ()	77 ()	267 (0)
One or more suspensions	45 (0)	34 (0)	29 (0)	71 (0)	179 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	105 (0)	121 (0)	249 (0)	278 (0)	753 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	184 (0)	227 (0)	249 (0)	278 (0)	938 (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.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	37%	57%	-20%	55%	-18%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	34%	53%	-19%	53%	-19%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	67%	-14%	67%	-14%
2018	44%	62%	-18%	65%	-21%
Compare		9%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	67%	-16%	70%	-19%
2018	45%	66%	-21%	68%	-23%
Compare		6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	28%	61%	-33%	61%	-33%
2018	33%	63%	-30%	62%	-29%
Compare		-5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	56%	-29%	57%	-30%
2018	20%	51%	-31%	56%	-36%
Compare		7%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	34	20	18	27	27	37	38		78	19
ELL	14	34	24	28	38	35	24	20		68	54
BLK	33	38	29	23	30	22	47	45		87	36
HSP	35	37	26	28	33	44	53	53		86	48
MUL	47	57		38	9		55				
WHT	49	44	35	35	31	24	70	62		78	40
FRL	36	38	29	28	33	31	52	48		84	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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	32	18	16	36	50	23	30		56	40
ELL	7	33	35	11	32			20		70	36
ASN	54	55		42							
BLK	35	37	29	22	29	39	38	40		88	39
HSP	40	48	40	25	35	47	44	46		84	46
MUL	54	45		9							
WHT	49	50	21	34	37	38	69	69		72	37
FRL	38	43	33	24	31	41	44	46		84	42
2017 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	12	32	32	20	29	40	34	26		60	4
ELL	9	28	22	29	37		40	27		69	38
BLK	32	41	35	25	21	22	50	37		82	22
HSP	37	41	27	30	33	35	63	51		85	45
MUL	38	60		47	40		64			80	
WHT	47	47	45	33	27	17	59	61		78	31
FRL	36	41	31	28	27	26	57	42		81	30

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	41
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

In math achievement, the data components that showed the lowest performance were math achievement and the gains of the lowest 25% of students. The overall low scores in both components may be due to a variety of factors. For instance, the data includes a percentage of students who tested in 8th grade but did not test again until the end of their 10th-grade year. The lack of data may make it difficult to assess where students' overall weaknesses are since the data doesn't reflect those students who do not test. Other contributing factors could be that the rigor needs to continue to increase while teachers provide more individualized instruction. Furthermore, the need for data chats with students to allow ownership of their performance in the classroom.

In ELA, the lowest data component was the learning gains for the bottom 25%. The writing scores went down throughout grade levels. The integration of knowledge and ideas is still a low area for the school. We also noticed that the SWD students and the ELL students were a significant portion of our

lowest quartile. Also, the previous cohort (currently seniors) were a higher achieving cohort, and we lost their scores last year (since they were juniors in the '18-'19 school year).

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

The "Math low 25% gains" showed the most significant decline from the prior year. The percentage decreased by 13 percentage points. In the past four years, the data shows that it has had a pattern of increase, followed by a decrease in the subsequent year. The previous difference was -14. While this may partly be due to chance and natural variations in the group, other factors may be contributing to the low scores. Identifying the students in this category early on is critical. These students may need more support through immediate intervention for those not mastering the math standards. In addition, parental involvement is necessary and can be acquired by ensuring that parents are informed about their student's performance in their math classes. Also, teachers should continue to collaborate and use the data from their assessments to guide 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 ELA achievement percentage is the most substantial difference between our scores and the state/district averages. Our achievement level is lower because we have a high ELL population, and the ELL students struggle with the ELA test as they learn the language. We also lag the state considerably in four of the five reporting categories.

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

Both our science and social studies achievement percentages are on an upward trend. Incorporating USATestprep into the curriculum in coherence with common assessments throughout these subject areas has provided teachers with productive and valuable data to use within their PLCs.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The potential area of concern is the number of students who failed a course in ELA or Math (753) as it relates to the number of students achieving a level 1 of statewide assessments (938).

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

1. Achieve more than 95% of students tested overall.
2. Increase overall learning gains in at least ELA and Math.
3. Increase acceleration points through advanced level courses or industry certification.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Literacy
Rationale	After desegregation of the FSA ELA data, we determined that synthesis and integration of ideas is one of the lowest components in need of remediation.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, all ninth and tenth-grade students will score at or above 41% in ELA as measured by the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carolyn Flanagan (carolyn.flanagan@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Through the gradual release of responsibility model (GRRM), teachers will effectively model how to plan, revise, and edit essays or responses. Once strategies are modeled and implemented, differentiation of instruction can occur within small groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Implementing GRRM allows teachers to model the use of the targeted strategy and then provides students with as much support (differentiate instruction and small group) as they need to progress toward independent use of the strategy. The need for the GRRM strategy is evident through FSA data, which shows that students are not able to demonstrate acquisition of the skills and strategies taught in the classroom. The use of the GRRM strategy is necessary to enable students as capable thinkers and learners when handling the tasks with which they have not yet developed expertise.
Action Step	
Description	In September of 2019 and ongoing, the school's literacy team (LLT) will promote literacy throughout the school by ensuring that each curricular area addresses literacy within their specific content. The LLT members are our curriculum leaders, as well as our literacy coach and PASL designee. They will ensure that the utilization of literacy practices occurs within all our monthly departmental PLC's. Through professional development (PD), teachers will attain the necessary skills and best practices that will enable them to remediate, enrich, and add rigor through literacy. Practices such as peer editing, GRRM, heterogeneous grouping, and differentiated instruction will help the enrichment of ESE, ELL, and Black students. Also, teachers will utilize standard-based progress monitoring assessments (PMA) to gauge student knowledge and drive instruction. The data collected will be used as a means for professional growth within the PLC setting. It will also assist in the development of future common assessments and pull-out/push-in groups. To accomplish the goal, teachers will need the following resources: plc planning, peer tutoring, flexible grouping, in-class support, authentic literature, and supplemental technology. The LLT and administration will monitor implementation and fidelity through classroom observations (informal/formal), PLC minutes/agendas, lesson plans, and PMA data.
Person Responsible	Patrick Berkley (patrick.berkley@browardschools.com)

#2	
Title	Black Subgroup
Rationale	After analyzing school/district/state data, Black students underperform all other racial subgroups in the all reporting categories. Statistically at Northeast, this subgroup of students make up more than half of each of the At-Risk Factors. Therefore, they are presented with the most barriers in regards to academic achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, our Black subgroup will score at or above 41% in FPPI as measured by the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carolyn Flanagan (carolyn.flanagan@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Through the use of social-emotional learning (SEL) strategies, teachers will use culturally relevant texts to increase engagement effectively. Once teachers infuse SEL strategies, the GRRM will allow them to expose the Black subgroup to differentiated instruction tailored to their needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In hopes of making instruction deliberate and meaningful, culturally relevant literature pieces will increase engagement and allow our Black subgroup to make a meaningful connection with the content. The Black subset of students can better acquire the skill sets being taught through the use of SEL practices coupled with the GRRM.
Action Step	
Description	In September of 2019 and ongoing, teachers will participate in monthly PD to attain the necessary skills and best practices to remediate, enrich, and add rigor using FSA standards. Methods such as GRRM, heterogeneous grouping, and differentiated instruction will help the enrichment of Black students. Teachers will engage students in authentic, real-world experiences while providing explicit instruction. The explicitness of their teaching will set a meaningful purpose, which will increase comprehension skills. This goal can be accomplished with the use of several resources such as authentic literature, PD in instructional methods and grouping of students, research-based instructional materials (developed through common assessments), and supplemental technology. Also, teachers will utilize standard-based progress monitoring assessments (PMA) to gauge student knowledge and drive instruction. The data collected will be used as a means for professional growth within the PLC setting. It will also assist in the development of future common assessments and pull-out/push-in groups. The School Leadership Team (SLT) will monitor implementation and fidelity through classroom observations (informal/formal), PLC minutes/agendas, lesson plans, and PMA data.
Person Responsible	Leslie Pickett (leslierivera@browardschools.com)

#3**Title** ELL Subgroup**Rationale** After analyzing school/district/state data, ELL students severely underperform all other subgroups in all reporting categories. ELLs historically struggle due to language acquisition; therefore, they perform lower on state assessments.**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

By June 2020, ELL students will score at or above 41% FPPI as measured by the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Eva Romero (eva.romero@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy

Teachers will use differentiated instruction through the utilization of various best practices, such as targeted small group instruction and scaffolding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

The differentiated instruction (DI) strategy enables teachers to meet ELL students at their level, and foster efficient and timely remediation. With the use of DI, teachers can utilize question stems and scaffolded lessons to accommodate the various learning styles (visual, auditory, kinesthetic, etc.) within small group instruction. The need for DI is evident through the diversity students bring to the classroom. ELL students differ as learners in terms of experiences, culture, language, gender, interests, readiness to learn, modes of learning, speed of learning, support systems for learning, and self-awareness as a learner.

Action Step**Description**

In September of 2019 and ongoing, teachers will participate in monthly PD to build capacity for differentiated instruction. Within their monthly PLCs, teachers will create targeted developmental practices for ELLs within a differentiated classroom. A district-based PD will be utilized to strengthen the necessary skills and ensure teachers cater to all types of learners. Teachers will engage students in authentic, real-world experiences while providing explicit instruction. Resources are a crucial component to the success of this goal. Therefore, to be effective, teachers will need further PD in instructional methods and grouping of ELL students, research-based and authentic ELL instructional materials, and supplemental technology. Also, teachers will utilize standard-based progress monitoring assessments (PMA) to gauge ELL student knowledge and adjust as needed. The data collected will be used as a means for professional growth within the PLC setting. It will also assist in the development of future common assessments and pull-out/push-in for the ELL subgroup. The School Leadership Team (SLT) will monitor implementation and fidelity through classroom observations (informal/formal), PLC minutes/agendas, lesson plans, and PMA data.

Person Responsible

Carolyn Flanagan (carolyn.flanagan@browardschools.com)

#4	
Title	SWD Subgroup
Rationale	After analyzing school/district/state data, the SWD subgroup severely underperformed all other subgroups (except ELL) in all reporting categories. Specialized instruction for SWD is needed to expose them to the kind of skill sets that would allow them to pass standardized assessments.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, all ninth and tenth-grade students will score at or above 41% FPPI as measured by the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Casey Pacella (casey.pacella@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	An effective approach to improving reading comprehension for the SWD subgroup is a combination of direct and strategy instruction. Strategy instruction requires teaching students a plan (or strategy) to search for patterns in words and to identify key passages and the main idea in each. Direct instruction supplemented via SWD Facilitators and Para-professionals will use the following instructional components: directed response/questioning, modeling of steps by the teacher, small group instruction, and strategy cues.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Once students learn specific strategies, they can generalize them to other reading comprehension tasks. SWD Facilitators and Para-professionals can be an asset when using the push-in model. Doing so will provide the student with an inclusive environment while targeting individualized student deficiencies through direct instruction. This strategy can improve word recognition skills by utilizing drills and repetition practices delivered one to one or in a small group.
Action Step	
Description	In September of 2019 and ongoing, teachers will participate in PD to acquire strategies for the effective inclusion of SWD. Within their monthly PLCs, teachers will develop curricular accommodations and modifications in their classes, embedding IEP goals into instructional activities and natural contexts. General and special education teachers will use the Florida Standards as the foundation for the instruction of all SWDs. Teachers will modify learning goals and instruction for SWDs using the same, or similar, age-appropriate materials as those used by students without disabilities. The ESE Specialist and the facilitators will play a vital role in ensuring the implementation of this strategy and provide additional support where necessary. Therefore, to be effective, teachers will need further PD in inclusive methods and grouping of SWD students, research-based and age-appropriate instructional materials, and supplemental technology. Also, teachers will utilize standard-based progress monitoring assessments (PMA) to gauge student knowledge and adjust instruction as needed. The data collected will be used as a means for professional growth within the PLC setting. It will also assist in the development of future common assessments and push-in for the SWD subgroup. The SLT will monitor fidelity of the implementation through classroom observations (informal/formal), PLC minutes/agendas, lesson plans, and PMA data. IEP meetings will further ensure each SWD need is met and provide teachers with the necessary support.

Person Responsible Ruth Hinkson (ruth.hinkson@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Through our PASL program and SEL initiatives, we will foster an inclusive environment where meaningful learning can occur. Also, expose students to a variety of College, Career & Life Readiness (CCLR) programs through their personalization period. This opportunity will enrich students and diversify their high school experience in alignment with our mission and vision. The master schedule will provide Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers with a common planning period to develop best practices for using manipulatives within the newly established math lab. The SLT will provide teachers with additional PD on differentiated instruction across all subject areas. In addition, all subject areas will utilize standard-based progress monitoring assessments (PMA) to gauge student knowledge and drive instruction. The data collected will be shared and analyzed in their content-specific PLCs to devise teaching practice(s) to remediate and enrich students effectively.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

N/A

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Literacy				\$8,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1241 - Northeast High School	School Improvement Funds		\$8,000.00
			<i>Notes: In efforts to further enhance differentiated instruction, adaptive learning platforms such as Reading Plus, Achieve3000, and Imagine Learning provide supplemental learning at an individualized student level. This software provide equity to every student by giving them access to the same grade-appropriate content in an environment that has the same look and feel regardless of their reading level.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Black Subgroup				\$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1241 - Northeast High School	School Improvement Funds		\$6,000.00
			<i>Notes: We will provide school-wide enrichment sessions on Saturdays. These sessions will target students in need of remediation in various subject areas and will provide an opportunity for teachers and students to revisit learning objectives and remediate learning as needed.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELL Subgroup				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1241 - Northeast High School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: We will provide school-wide enrichment sessions on Saturdays. These sessions will target students in need of remediation in various subject areas and will provide an opportunity for teachers and students to revisit learning objectives and remediate learning as needed.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: SWD Subgroup				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1241 - Northeast High School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: We will provide school-wide enrichment sessions on Saturdays. These sessions will target students in need of remediation in various subject areas and will provide an opportunity for teachers and students to revisit learning objectives and remediate learning as needed.</i>			
Total:						\$15,000.00