

Florida Atlantic University - College of Education

A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High School

777 GLADES RD BLDG 26, Boca Raton, FL 33431

www.adhus.fau.edu

Demographics

Principal: Joel Herbst

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2021-22 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (89%) 2018-19: A (88%) 2017-18: A (86%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the FAU Lab Sch County School Board on 10/19/2022.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High School

777 GLADES RD BLDG 26, Boca Raton, FL 33431

www.adhus.fau.edu

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	23%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the FAU Lab Sch County School Board on 10/19/2022.

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.

A.D. Henderson University School and FAU High School endeavors to: (1) demonstrate best practices in teacher education; (2) innovate, develop, and provide students with a challenging curriculum, balanced with innovative academic support; and (3) conduct and support emerging educational research.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Alexander D. Henderson University School/FAU High School (ADHUS/FAUHS) is a national exemplary model for school systems and teacher preparation programs improving education for diverse student populations through innovative, faculty-developed research and curriculum.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Herbst, Joel	Principal	Principal/Superintendent
Hoff, Cornelia	Assistant Principal	Middle School Assistant Principal
Hallstrom, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	High School Assistant Principal
Cook, Tamara	Behavior Specialist	Assessment and Behavior Coordinator
Simzer, Ana	Instructional Coach	Instructional Facilitator
Hufty, Gina	Instructional Coach	Instructional Facilitator/Reading Coach
Robinson, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Elementary Assistant Principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Joel Herbst

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

24

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,328

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	60	60	63	61	72	74	77	79	82	157	175	193	173	1326	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	6	4	4	4	2	1	5	2	0	0	0	32	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	4	0	0	2	0	10	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	6	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	0	0	0	0	0	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/16/2022

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	59	61	59	60	70	71	80	81	82	148	172	175	175	1293
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	7	4	9	7	7	5	7	6	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	1	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	59	61	59	60	70	71	80	81	82	148	172	175	175	1293	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	7	4	9	7	7	5	7	6	0	0	0	60	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	3	1	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	93%	80%	55%				93%	83%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	76%						81%	74%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	74%						75%	66%	54%
Math Achievement	92%	59%	42%				92%	84%	62%
Math Learning Gains	80%						76%	70%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	85%						76%	62%	52%
Science Achievement	92%	81%	54%				88%	76%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	99%	73%	59%				99%	94%	78%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	91%	77%	14%	58%	33%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	89%	79%	10%	58%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2022					
	2019	85%	71%	14%	56%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
06	2022					
	2019	89%	74%	15%	54%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
07	2022					
	2019	85%	76%	9%	52%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
08	2022					
	2019	89%	84%	5%	56%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	92%	79%	13%	62%	30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	85%	74%	11%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	92%	67%	25%	60%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
06	2022					
	2019	94%	90%	4%	55%	39%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				
07	2022					
	2019	87%	79%	8%	54%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-94%				
08	2022					
	2019	97%	66%	31%	46%	51%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	84%	64%	20%	53%	31%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	74%	73%	1%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	100%	0%	67%	33%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	91%	8%	71%	28%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	0%	0%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	94%	-2%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	100%	0%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	55	69	68	62	75	74	57				
ELL	88	55		94	82						
ASN	97	85	91	100	100		100			100	100
BLK	90	75	74	83	66	69	83	93	80	100	100
HSP	94	77	82	95	87	97	95	100	97	100	100
MUL	90	78		88	70		100				
WHT	93	72	67	92	79	86	89	100	92	100	100
FRL	89	72	72	86	77	77	82	96	87	100	100
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	28	31	26	34	41	38	21				
ELL	77	85	100	81	40						
ASN	98	89	94	91	57		95			100	100
BLK	81	62	60	69	45	44	76	90	73	100	100
HSP	94	83	85	88	62	64	87	100	71	100	100
MUL	90	76		89	67		85				
WHT	92	76	73	90	59	67	90	88	82	100	100
FRL	83	70	70	78	48	52	71	88	74	100	100
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	47	70	63	56	68	64	64				
ELL	79	65	30	80	75						
ASN	100	96	100	100	78		95			100	100

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
BLK	89	88	82	88	67	78	75	100	90	100	100
HSP	94	78	71	91	73	70	92	100	89	100	100
MUL	85	83		86	78		100				
WHT	93	77	68	94	80	79	86	96	88	100	100
FRL	89	79	71	88	72	73	77	100	88	100	100

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	89
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	983
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	66
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	80
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	97
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	83
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	93
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	85
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	88
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	85
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

FY22 statewide assessments in English Language Arts show learning gains trending downward for total students and lowest 25%.

Learning Gains in mathematics, however, show improvement in both groups (total students and lowest 25%).

Science achievement shows a 5 percentage point increase from FY21 and 1.2 points increase from FY18.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Learning gains for students in English Language Arts, particularly in the middle school, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Staff turnover and new teachers in the middle school may have contributed to the results. Teachers will continue to participate in professional learning focused on new standards, engage in collaborative planning with their teams, and track student data using the FAST assessments to monitor student progress.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In FY22, mathematics showed the most improvement from the prior year (5.9 percentage points).

Learning gains during the same period improved 22.4 percentage points for total students and 24.8 points for the lowest 25%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In FY21, many students were attending school remotely, particularly in the first semester. Online learning may have had a negative effect on those students who struggle in mathematics. To address this deficit, a school focus on math achievement and after school tutoring may have contributed to this improvement in FY22.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Progress monitoring, data chats, tutoring

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Lesson planning conferences, coaching, state, regional and national conference attendance, Professional Learning Communities, Research Communities of Practice, Linking Walks, quarterly data chats

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Continue to utilize CARES Act funding to implement tutoring and other support early and often. Determine struggling students early in the school year through formative assessment data (F.A.S.T., iReady, ALEKS) and analysis along with whole-team quarterly data chats and provide those students with interventions during and after school as necessary to close any gaps remaining as a result of the pandemic.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Overall, 76% of students in grades 3-10 made learning gains in English Language Arts in 2022, which represents a decrease of 1 percentage point from the 20-21 school year, and 5 percentage point decrease from the 19-20 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 79% of students will make learning gains as indicated by the English Language Arts PM-3 results of the F.A.S.T. in the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

School administrators and team leaders will monitor progress on the implementation of strategies and assessments through classroom walkthroughs, data chats, and grade level and team meetings.

The school's comprehensive evidence-based reading plan decision tree will guide the instruction, progress monitoring, and intervention process.

Progress toward this goal will be measured by the F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data, along with iReady data will be used to measure.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joel Herbst (jherbst1@fau.edu)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Utilize designated daily intervention time for ELA interventions and ongoing progress monitoring through a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). Elementary and middle school teachers will use iReady to monitor progress. Kindergarten through third grade teachers will use Wilson's Foundations for Tier 1 phonics instruction, with a more intensive intervention model implemented for students who require Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Many studies support the use of an explicit, systematic, and multisensory approach to instruction in phonological awareness and phonics, see two IES meta-analyses that support this claim here and here (linked). In addition to the research cited, these essential skills are highlighted in Florida's new ELA B.E.S.T. Standards as part of the cornerstones of reading.

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.

ELEMENTARY

>Use assessment data (F.A.S.T., iReady, and reading running records) to establish a baseline and monitor progress.

>Identify student needs through the MTSS process which includes: (a)monthly School-based Team (SBT) meetings; (b)daily What-I-Need (WIN) groups that target remediation and acceleration; and (c)Progress monitoring.

>Continue coaching cycles and literacy walks to target instruction.

- >Implement after school tutoring in reading.
- >Engage parents in their children's literacy (Literacy Night, Read-at-home project, New Worlds Reading Initiative).

Person Responsible Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

MIDDLE SCHOOL

- >Utilize multiple data points for progress monitoring from iReady, CommonLit, and No Red Ink, in the Middle School.
- >Focus Middle School Cross-curricular PLCs on supporting the B.E.S.T. Standards in ELA that indicate the lowest proficiency and identify effective strategies to use in classrooms to help assist with mastery of those standards.
- >Use data chats to identify students not meeting grade level standards and provide research based interventions.
- >Implement academic intervention for students identified as having deficiencies in one or more standards based on multiple data sources.

Person Responsible Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

HIGH SCHOOL

- >Provide ESE support using the push-in model for ELA
- >Utilize progress monitoring data along with classroom data and grades to assess progress and plan for support.
- >Use data to identify ELA standards with the lowest proficiency and the students who make up the lowest quartile to offer targeted support.
- >Implement data chats with teachers, administration, and school counselors to initiate an intervention plan that includes tutoring and monitoring.
- >Establish bi-weekly monitoring and adjust the intervention plan as needed.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hallstrom (khallstrom@fau.edu)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Overall, 80% of students made learning gains in mathematics on the FY22 FSA/EOCs, which represents an increase of 23 percentage points from FY21, and a 4 percentage point increase from the 19-20 school year.

Measurable Outcome:**State the specific**

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

At least 83% of students will make learning gains in mathematics as indicated by the Mathematics PM-3 results of the F.A.S.T. in the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data as well as iReady data will be used to monitor students' grade level progress. School administrators and team leaders utilize quarterly data chats, classroom walkthroughs, classroom-level data analysis, and grade level and team meeting feedback to monitor progress on the implementation of strategies and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joel Herbst (jherbst1@fau.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Use math assessment data from F.A.S.T. progress monitoring (K-9) and from iReady (K-5) to identify students in need of intervention. Math interventions will focus on proficient problem solving models, guided practice with feedback, and ongoing cumulative review (IES Practice Guide)

In grades 5 through 9, Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) software, which is based on Knowledge Space Theory, provides an exact and comprehensive description of students' competence in math with a list of topics that students are ready to learn.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Targeted mathematics instructional strategies using rich contexts, discovery, and explicit instruction that are individualized based on student needs are aligned with evidence-based, best practices for struggling learners.

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.

ELEMENTARY

- >Use math assessment data from F.A.S.T. and iReady to monitor progress.
- >Identify student needs through the MTSS process (Monthly SBT meetings, daily What-I-Need (WIN) groups that target remediation and acceleration, and response to intervention).
- >Monitor student mastery of grade level standards through classwork and assessments.
- >Provide enrichment opportunities for acceleration by identifying possible leveled groups during math

instruction.

>Provide after school tutoring in math

Person Responsible Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

MIDDLE SCHOOL

>Analyze F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessment data to identify student deficiencies across grade level mathematics standards.

>Use ALEKS placement/diagnostic data to place students on a pathway to master the grade level content.

>Provide students with after-school academic support for 9 weeks, focused on a targeted skill.

>Exit students from tutoring if they score at least 75% on the ALEKS assessment based on their deficient targeted skills.

Person Responsible Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

HIGH SCHOOL

>Analyze F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessment data to identify student deficiencies across grade level mathematics standards.

>Use ALEKS placement/diagnostic data to place students on a pathway to master the grade level content.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hallstrom (khallstrom@fau.edu)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Implementation of Character Education Program

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Character education (CE) has been credited with improving integrity, compassion, and self-discipline (Jeynes, 2019). In a meta analysis of character education programs, Jeynes (2019) found statistically significant effects of CE on a variety of behavioral actions including increased self-control, decreased violence, fewer suspensions, and “less bad behavior.” Responses from parents and families on the FY22 annual parent survey revealed the follow results:
Approximately 9.5% of families disagreed or strongly disagreed that their child had a positive attitude about school. When asked about their child’s relationship with their teacher, 3.8% disagreed that their child had a positive relationship with his/her teacher.
Character Counts! is one of the most widely used character education frameworks in the country. By implementing this program with fidelity, students, staff, and parents form a partnership and hear a consistent message about character traits that are vital for success in school.

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

Results from the FY23 parent/family survey will show a 5% decrease of the disagree/strongly disagree responses in each of the following survey items: parents’ perception of their child’s attitude about school and their belief about their child’s positive attitude with their classroom teacher.

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

School administrators, instructional facilitators, and the Student Behavior Coordinator will utilize classroom/school walkthroughs, student discipline data, and grade level and team meeting feedback to monitor progress on the implementation Character Counts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joel Herbst (jherbst1@fau.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Classroom teachers will implement Character Counts! daily lessons with fidelity. Expected behaviors will be reinforced and rewarded throughout the school day in a variety of contexts. The School Based Team will suggest interventions as needed. School counselors will reinforce expected behaviors through interventions and small group lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Practices that research (see IES Practice Guide) has shown to reduce problem behaviors include teaching and reinforcing new skills to increase appropriate behavior. In addition, adopting a schoolwide approach to prevent problem behaviors and increase positive interactions may also be used to reduce problematic behaviors. To meet these recommendations, the school will implement Character Counts! schoolwide.

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 training to all staff on the 6 pillars and the implementation of Character Counts! before the start of the school year.

Share common language and expectations and practice in class during daily lessons.

Use visual school and classroom reminders and ongoing communication with students and parents to reinforce desired behaviors.

Implement monthly student incentives and rewards to increase engagement and reinforce expectations..

Provide mid-year training for difficult classroom behaviors (ie: ADHD-related, social skill deficits).

Person Responsible Tamara Cook (tcookwashington@fau.edu)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Implementation of the new character education program, Character Counts! will enhance the school's positive culture and environment. The curriculum is centered around "six pillars of character" including trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenships. Each pillar is meant to support a culture of kindness, making our school a safer environment for students to learn.

Daily lessons in every grade, kindergarten through grade 9, teach the meaning behind each pillar. Each month one pillar becomes the focus and is reinforced throughout the school. Students are recognized for their exemplary display of the focus pillar.

The School Counseling Team focuses on students' social and emotional health by initiating the use of universal screeners for early identification of students who may be at-risk or in need of intervention beyond Tier 1. This is an effort to implement comprehensive, proactive support services throughout the year.

Wrap-around services include parent workshops on topics that address the three ASCA student standards domains (Social-Emotional, Academic, Career), classroom lessons that meet the comprehensive health mandate, Red Ribbon Week, recognizing and celebrating healthy choices, Monique Burr Foundation curriculum highlighting safety, and National Bullying Prevention Month.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Parents, guardians, and caregivers provide input on curriculum, health and safety, accessibility, and extracurricular activities through annual surveys, PTO meetings, and SAB meetings. Families receive a link to the monthly community newsletter that includes embedded links for follow up questions. Teachers and school staff provide input on curriculum, professional development needs, health and safety through the annual Survey of Needs, quarterly data chats, and monthly grade level meetings. The school's administration leads teacher effectiveness through a cycle of observation and feedback, monitors student achievement using progress monitoring assessment scores, and manages budgeted allocations to ensure

student success. Finally, the School Advisory Body provides input on school policies, procedures, and equitability through monthly meetings and subcommittees.