

Broward County Public Schools

Stranahan High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Stranahan High School

1800 SW 5TH PL, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Stranahan High School is to educate all students to the highest levels of academic achievement, to empower them to reach and expand their potential, and to prepare them to become productive, responsible, ethical, creative, and compassionate leaders in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Stranahan High School is committed to transforming all students into lifelong learners and leaders in a global society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Padura, Michelle	Principal	Provide 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.
Sanon, Kamara	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer, and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff, and community. Ms. Sanon monitors progress for accountability for Biology and English Language Arts, Acceleration, and Graduation Rates. She oversees Student Services and the School Advisory Council. She is the 11th Grade Administrator.
Goodwin, Robert	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer, and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff, and community. Mr. Goodwin is responsible for the progress monitoring and accountability for Social Studies and U.S History EOC. In addition, Mr. Goodwin oversees ESE, Testing, and the progress monitoring of the attendance plan. Mr. Goodwin is the 9th-grade administrator.
Smith, Brooke	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer, and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff, and community. Ms. Smith is responsible for the progress monitoring and accountability for Algebra I, Geometry, and Learning Gains. She is the 12th-grade administrator.
Cope, Robin	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Cope is the school's ESE director and is responsible for the creation and implementation of the BPIE Plan. She oversees the support of our school's ESE and SWD population by progress monitoring student IEPs and ensuring students receive academic, social, and emotional support for success.
Brown, Sebrina	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Ms. Brown is the Curriculum Leader for Math and is responsible for the progress monitoring data for Algebra 1 and Geometry. She will also be assuming the duties as the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		ESSA support coordinator for Math and will be overseeing the pull-out support and remediation of our non-AAP students.
Brown, Chukwunyerem	Instructional Coach	Mr. Brown is the school Math coach and is responsible for our progress monitoring data and working to support the Geometry and Algebra 1 PLCs. He provides pull-out support and remediation to our 12-grade students.
Ward, Kenneth	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Mr. Ward is the instructional leader over the science curriculum, the a member of the school advisory committee, and activley oversees the school improvement team.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

During monthly School Advisory Council Committee Meetings, the accountability data is shared with parents, staff, students and other stakeholders. All stakeholders can then ask questions regarding our school improvement plans and provide input as needed.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan will be monitored through monthly Student Advisory Council meetings. In these meetings Stranahan stakeholders will be made aware of current student levels. It is during this time that each department will also make stakeholders aware of extended learning opportunities in efforts to increase parent engagement, boost student moral, and encourage staff voice and choice. In addition, the Stranahan school leadership team will meet monthly. At these meetings Curriculum Leaders will share out problem of practice and plans of implementation, Furthermore, this time will also be used to present and track student data for various ESSA subgroups. ESSA subgroups in leadership meetings will be an extension of what is discussed in PLC meetings. PLC meetings allow each department to track ESSA data as it relates to their specific content areas with literacy being a focal point for every content area. PLCs will also use CFAs as a way to track SWD current levels. At this time Teachers in their respective content areas will dialogue and document methods that they are using to close the achievement gap for SWD. Finally teachers will play a huge role in monitoring the SIP. Stranahan aims to boost Teacher moral by highlighting Teachers for their works. These works include celebrating student success, allowing Teachers to share ideas at staff and faculty meetings, and giving Teachers the opportunity to highlight their successful programs at SAC meetings. The leadership team will continue to follow up with school wide expectations using Monday Morning Communication methods

as a way to keep a constant method of communication with Teachers. The leadership team at Stranahan believes that teacher and parent engagement is the key to increasing the overall moral of the school and as a result will help to increase student enrollment while also helping to retain current students. Stranahan leadership team believes that it will take a collaborative effort from Administration, Teachers, Students, and Parents to bring the School Improvement Plan to fruition.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	50	50	36	52	51	37		
ELA Learning Gains				44			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			34		
Math Achievement*	23	36	38	23	41	38	19		
Math Learning Gains				46			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			36		
Science Achievement*	46	60	64	37	35	40	35		
Social Studies Achievement*	45	66	66	46	51	48	34		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	95	90	89	95	54	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	51	61	65	53	66	67	62		
ELP Progress	45	50	45	39			42		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	344
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	516
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	95

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	4	1
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	49			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	46			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	39			23			46	45		95	51	45
SWD	18			4			34	10		14	6	
ELL	16			19			14	22		33	7	45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			22			43	39		49	7	46
HSP	33			22			48	50		55	7	42
MUL	50										1	
PAC												
WHT	67			31			63	71		75	6	
FRL	36			21			41	40		49	7	48

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	36	44	30	23	46	67	37	46		95	53	39
SWD	17	25	19	17	39	47	14	35		84	33	
ELL	17	35	29	26	61	77	26	36		93	44	39
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	34	42	24	18	43	70	33	43		95	50	50
HSP	35	44	33	29	49	57	40	48		92	61	36
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47	55		41	53		47	73		100	64	
FRL	32	39	27	20	46	69	33	44		95	52	52

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	37	43	34	19	25	36	35	34		97	62	42
SWD	23	33	22	23	34	47	37	42		93	32	
ELL	25	43	30	18	20	21	26			94	52	42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	41	36	11	23	42	30	48		99	58	40
HSP	42	46	30	29	30	24	42			94	65	43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43	47		44	41		64			83	73	
FRL	34	43	36	17	24	36	36	32		98	63	49

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

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

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

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	42%	49%	-7%	50%	-8%
09	2023 - Spring	34%	49%	-15%	48%	-14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	48%	-25%	50%	-27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	27%	46%	-19%	48%	-21%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	44%	63%	-19%	63%	-19%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	62%	-17%	63%	-18%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The trends in the Early Warning Indicators show 618 students having attendance below 90%, contributing to the number of students failing ELA and Math. The same can be said for students scoring at level one on the state assessments in Math and ELA. Student performance data in ELA, Algebra, Geometry, Biology, and US History are still considerably low compared to the state and district. This information proves that our student demographics, comprised of 68% Black and 30% Hispanic populations, are underserved and require additional attention. Although our school has excellent Progress Monitoring Assessments, the progress monitoring data suggests departments need to progress monitor with additional fidelity as there are substantial deficits in Math and ELA. According to the Subgroup Data, many of our SWD and ELL student populations, considered underserved populations, demonstrate low proficiency in all reporting assessment categories. According to research, underserved and vulnerable students have more barriers to success than their affluent counterparts. The ESSA Data shows SWD students are currently at 33, considerably below the accepted Federal Index of 41. The SWD remained consistently low in Math despite making decent gains last year, contributing to a ten-point ESSA Index increase. Looking at the data, it appears this area was the only category with significant declines.

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

The school data component that decreased was the US History by one percentage point. The reporting category for Acceleration decreased by 4 percentage points. These results were impacted by a decrease in on-campus dual enrollment.

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 most significant data gap was in Math Achievement, with a 23-point achievement gap compared to the pre-pandemic state average performance. The data reveals the need for more accurate progress monitoring across all reporting categories in Economically Disadvantaged, SWD, and ELL subgroups with a continued effort for all students. For the SWD subgroups, the areas of learning gains, the learning gains of the lower 25%, and achievement are critical and need improvement. Although the ELL subgroup made substantial gains, the proficiency level remained low and will require additional attention along with the SWD subgroup. According to research, underserved and vulnerable student populations tend to have more barriers to success than their affluent counterparts. Although our school has excellent Progress Monitoring Assessments, the progress monitoring data suggests departments need to progress monitor with additional fidelity moving forward as there is substantial missing data. According to the Subgroup Data, many of our SWD and ELL student populations, considered underserved populations, demonstrate low proficiency in all reporting assessment categories. In addition, the SWD remained consistently low in Math despite making decent gains last year, contributing to a ten-point ESSA Index increase. Looking at the data, this area was the only category with significant declines.

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

Biology showed the most significant improvement from the previous year, with a 9-point gain. This was due to teachers meeting the academic needs of their students through an authentic PLC continuous improvement cycle and the monitoring of the Common Formative Assessments. The Biology PLC team was provided with district support during each academic cycle. Teachers used supporting educational resources such as USA Test Prep, purchased using school improvement accountability funds. Students are provided Environmental Science in their 9th-grade year and then progress to Biology in their 10th-grade year, providing two years of standards-based instruction in living sciences.

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

NOTE: The Early Warning Systems section and this corresponding question are no longer required to be completed for grades 9-12 for the State SIP, per the Florida Department of Education.

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

1. ESSA SWD sub-group
2. Math achievement
3. Teacher retention

Area of Focus

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In order to address the area of focus being positive culture environment we will work to retain and recruit teachers. It is noted that teacher turnover rate is high as a result of high cost of living locally, and teachers feeling overwhelmed by new legislative expectations. To address the apprehensions of teachers, Stranahan will ensure that teachers are well equipped to provide meaningful services to their students. This will start with professional developments that will equip teachers with training in various topics that are essential for delivering instruction. These topics include classroom management, relevant lesson planning, celebrating success, and methods of delivering Social Emotional Learning tactics. These trainings will allow teachers to be mentored by district personnel, support their learning, and provide a collaborative space for faculty. Furthermore the leadership team will put an emphasis on highlighting teacher success during learning walks. In these learning walks Teachers will receive accolades for implementing methods that are learned through Professional Development.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By August 2024, the teacher retention rate will increase by 5%, bringing our retention rate from 88% in the 2023 school year to 93% for the 2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by analyzing the amount of teacher transfer request, and monthly teacher surveys to monitor teacher moral. Surveys will allow monthly insight to teachers well being. The surveys will also give the leadership team a live look at how their teacher are feeling about their work environment, and what is needed for them to thrive.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kamara Sanon (kamara.sanon@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teacher Induction for Effectiveness and Retention (T.I.E.R.) provides a school-based instructional support system for teachers new to the profession. The new educator support is weekly through a school-based T.I.E.R. Mentor, along with monthly support meetings facilitated by the T.I.E.R. School Liaison. T.I.E.R. is designed to be unique to each school, and is research-based with norms of inquiry and trust supporting new educators in building their craft. The leadership team will also offer methods of public praise by giving gift cards at faculty meetings and offering various teacher appreciation activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher recognition is important in efforts of retaining and attracting new instructors. Positive recognition will increase teacher commitment and help to foster a sense of community around the school. Teachers are more likely to thrive in environments that cater to their overall wellbeing and aim to highlight their success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Teachers will have monthly surveys to give administration insight on the state of their teachers.
- Finally the Leadership team will continue to encourage an open door policy as a method to encourage teachers to be vocal in matters concerning the work place.
- Action steps include surveys being given to teachers, surveys are then submitted to administration, and finally administration analyzes and assess survey results. Once survey results are analyzed feed back and suggestions will be given to staff members in accordance to survey results.

Person Responsible: Kamara Sanon (kamara.sanon@browardschools.com)

By When: These action steps will occur monthly. Results will be discussed and administration meetings.

- TIER mentors and mentees will meet weekly. During this time new teachers will discuss lesson planning methods, classroom management strategies, and ways to use various resources provided by the district.
- Mentors and Mentees will meet collectively once a month.

Person Responsible: Kamara Sanon (kamara.sanon@browardschools.com)

By When: These actions will be monitored in monthly TIER meetings.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The review of the ESSA data indicates the school is below the ESSA Index of 41, although the school has been improving in this area. The ELL increased to above the index of 41, but the school has decided to continue to focus on this vulnerable population. Currently, the student achievement for our Students with Disabilities is below average in Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary and Reading Informational Text. According to PM3 data from the 2023 F.A.S.T. assessment, 54% of our 9th grade SWD were below Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary proficiency. 50% of our 10th grade SWD were below Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary proficiency. 46% of 9th grade SWD were below command in Reading Informational Text. 50% of 10th grade SWD were below proficiency in Reading Informational Text. Therefore, developing a cohesive instructional strategy to address these two targeted Reading Domains and yield 70% or higher student achievement on PM1 is necessary. SWDs in Biology have difficulty understanding concepts and connecting them. SSS Biology Standards are interconnected and require that students participate in hands-on labs and use manipulatives to conceptualize the standards-based biological process.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ESSA Federal Index for SWD will increase from 33 to 41 by May 2024 as evidenced by the state-wide accountability reporting categories for ELA, Math, U.S. History, and Biology.

Monitoring:

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

School administrators assigned to each reporting category will monitor the progress during each grading quarter. The Algebra 1, Geometry, Biology, US History, and ELA PLCs will monitor their respective CFA data according to the disaggregation of the SWD subgroup quarterly. Students identified within Math and ELA as not making adequate academic progress will be pulled out by the school's ESSA Math positional teacher for added intensive academic support weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Goodwin (bobby.goodwin@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In addition to the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) model of support to address the variance of learning needs of ALL students, the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) educational framework will be used to guide the development of flexible learning environments and learning spaces to accommodate individual learning differences. Additional interventions include: 1. Spacing- spreading out studying of material over time instead of "cramming" before EOC; 2. Interleaving- switching among different topics while studying to allow connections to be made in the overall subject area; 3. Elaborative interrogation- asking students questions to ensure they understand and allowing them to question the instructor to determine if they are making connections and understanding the material; 4. Dual Coding- teaching the material in different formats (often words and pictures) such as Kahoot!, Quizlet, CANVAS quizzes, etc.; and 5. Small Group- small number of students to remediate instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Many of our students encounter social and emotional barriers due to their socioeconomic position. MTSS helps to provide tiered interventive support for those identified areas of student need. Our SWD population has IEP and UDL, allowing differentiated instructional practices to meet our SWD needs. The above interventions have documented (evidence-based) success for SWD in assisting them with comprehension and retention of information and conforming to the IEP accommodations evident in the student's IEP.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

US History - SWD students had historically low pass rates for US History EOC, and SWD also showed poor performance in Economics Financial Literacy classes.

-Teachers will review SWD grades related to classwork, quizzes, and tests. This information will be reviewed with the Support Facilitator, and areas of concern will be focused on as part of the evidence-based intervention.

-Teacher PD training ensures that IEP accommodations are understood and used during instruction. (ESE Specialist)

-Include pull-out and push-in support from Support Facilitators and incorporate the material in our Learning Strategies classes. (Support Facilitators)

-Collaboration with teachers by Support Facilitators (Support Facilitators) -Classwork assignments/tests/quizzes from the beginning of quarter {pretests} and compare to end of quarter {posttests} to be reviewed quarterly. (teachers)

Person Responsible: Scott Fiore (scott.fiore@browardschools.com)

By When: The action step will be implemented and monitored during academic cycles within each academic quarter leading to the state US History EOC exam administered in May 2024.

Biology

-District-developed Common formative assessments will be used to monitor the impact of hands-on/project-based learning on students with disabilities. This information will be tracked in Mastery Connect.

-Teachers will implement the following: 1. Diagnostic Assessment to obtain baseline data; 2. PLC to share best practices and design curriculum; 3. Review each student's IEP and provide preferential seating; 4. Teach interactive lessons; 5. Check for understanding throughout studies; 6. Administer CFA; 7. PLC to review data, and 8. Provide remediation as needed through looping and connecting standards.

Person Responsible: Kenneth Ward (kenneth.ward@browardschools.com)

By When: The action step will be implemented and monitored during academic cycles within each academic quarter leading to the state Biology EOC exam administered in May 2024.

Math - To address this area of focus, the mathematics teachers will perform the following:

1. Teachers will have the students use the P.E.E.L. Writing Strategy in response to selected question stems, which will encourage the students to assimilate new knowledge and summarize the lesson content;
2. Teachers will use graphic organizers during instruction, such as Concept Maps, Venn Diagrams, Frayer models, or Comparison Charts to model mathematical concepts;
3. Teachers will use vocabulary-building activities to improve student comprehension and support content retention;
4. Teachers will implement cooperative learning activities to encourage discussion of the course content

and collaboration; and

5. The ESSER Math Teacher and the SWD Support Personnel will push into classes and pull out students to support instruction and remediation.

Person Responsible: Sebrina Brown (sebrina.brown@browardschools.com)

By When: The action step will be implemented and monitored during academic cycles within each academic quarter leading to the state Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC exams administered in May 2024.

ELA

-School administrators will monitor the student's progress each quarter.

-The ELA and Reading joint planning, along with PLCs, will monitor their data according to the disaggregation of the SWD subgroup.

- In addition, the struggling SWD will receive additional support through weekly pull-out sessions.

-The administrator responsible for the SWD subgroups will conduct periodic classroom walk-throughs and quarterly data chats. The overall proficiency will determine if the achievement gap is closing.

-Reading and Language Arts teachers will implement the Point Evidence Explanation and Link to paragraph (P.E.E.L) writing strategy. This writing strategy will ultimately improve reading and writing skills.

-In addition, SWDs who are performing below standards will be pulled out for additional remediation and support.

Person Responsible: Kamara Sanon (kamara.sanon@browardschools.com)

By When: The action step will be implemented and monitored during each academic cycle within each academic quarter leading up to the state FAST assessment administered in May 2024.

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

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

The B.E.S.T. Spring 2023 Algebra and Geometry EOC Exam data shows that the students are not achieving at the average district and state levels. The 2023 math proficiency score was 23% and below the district and state averages of 51.2% and 53.1%, respectively. Looking at a three-year trend, the students with disabilities subgroup decreased proficiency by 6%, dropping from 23% to 17%. We also noticed a decrease in the white subgroup by 3 percent, decreasing from 44% to 41%. However, the English language learner subgroup increased by 8%, from 18% to 26%. African American subgroup proficiency also increased by 7%, from 11% to 18%. Finally, the Hispanic subgroup did not change within the last three years. To improve student achievement for the 2024 EOC Exams, the area of focus for the mathematics department will be to increase the rigor of instruction by using varied questioning techniques that promote engagement, check for understanding, and encourage higher-order thinking among the students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome that the mathematics department plans to achieve using this area of focus is to (1) improve the Algebra EOC Exam Proficiency Score from 23% in May of 2023 to 26% in May of 2024 and (2) improve the Geometry EOC Exam Proficiency Score from 28% in May of 2023 to 31% in May of 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The data from the District Common Formative Assessments (CFA's) for Algebra and Geometry will be used to measure the effectiveness of using varied questioning techniques to increase rigor in instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Smith (brooke.smith@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Using varied questioning techniques during instruction is an evidence-based strategy for increasing rigor. The teachers will become proficient in using research-vetted questioning stems and student response management techniques during the instruction of the Algebra and Geometry course content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Many educational researchers, such as Webb, Bloom, Hattie, and Marzano, have identified using varied questioning techniques in instruction as a high-yield strategy. The results of the district Algebra and Geometry CFA's will be used to provide the teachers with the efficacy of this instructional strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Progress Monitoring of Rigorous Instruction

1. Teachers will use questioning stems, like Webb's Depth of Knowledge Question Stems and Bloom's Taxonomy Question Stems, to present high-level questions and build rigor during instruction.
2. Teachers will use questioning response management techniques, like wait time, clarification, or redirection, to drive the student's focus toward the lesson objective.

Person Responsible: Brooke Smith (brooke.smith@browardschools.com)

By When: The action step will be implemented and monitored during academic cycles within each academic quarter leading to the state Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC exams administered in May 2024.

Progress Monitoring of Student Responses

1. Teachers will have the students use the P.E.E.L. Writing Strategy in response to selected question stems to encourage the students to assimilate new knowledge and summarize the lesson content.
2. Teachers will conduct data chats with the students to encourage their awareness of their learning. The teachers will also have the students complete individualized data forms to track their course progress and to promote their responsibility for and motivation for learning.
3. Selected students who perform below mastery will receive small group and individualized instruction during pull-out sessions by the ESSER Math Support Teacher. The students will be homogeneously grouped by level of performance and will receive specialized remediation and enrichment for deeper learning.

Person Responsible: Sebrina Brown (sebrina.brown@browardschools.com)

By When: The action step will be implemented and monitored during academic cycles within each academic quarter leading to the state Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC exams administered in May 2024.

Progress Monitoring of Data

Teachers will collect, disaggregate, and analyze the results of the district CFA's to assess student mastery of the course content and evaluate the efficacy of using varied questioning techniques.

Person Responsible: Chukwunyerem Brown (chukwunyerem.brown@browardschools.com)

By When: The action step will be implemented and monitored during academic cycles within each academic quarter leading to the state Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC exams administered in May 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The district allocates the school accountability funds based on the annual FTE count. The School Advisory Council (SAC) determines school improvement accountability funds allocations through Sunshine State Statutes requirements. The funds are based on the alignment of the school improvement needs and are voted on by the members of the SAC through a quorum.