

Broward County Public Schools

Mcarthur 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Mcarthur High School

6501 HOLLYWOOD BLVD, Hollywood, FL 33024

[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 McArthur High School is to ensure an optimum teaching and learning environment which enables students to become physically, intellectually, socially, and emotionally strong. The curriculum provides experiences that allow students to develop competencies in preparation for accepting the responsibilities and challenges of adults in a changing society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

McArthur High School is dedicated to striving for excellence in an ever-changing world. Providing students real-world 21st-century learning experiences, rigorous college preparatory, and interdisciplinary strategies that prepare our students to be college and career ready. Creating a safe learning environment while maximizing all students' potential for becoming global productive citizens in society. We embrace diversity, offer equitable opportunities for all, and promote pride in our school and community.

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
Broomfield, Alfred	Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assume administrative responsibility and instructional leadership under the supervision of the superintendent in accordance with rules and regulations of the School Board, for the planning, management, operation, and evaluation of the educational program of the school to which the individual is assigned. 2. Submit recommendations to the Superintendent regarding the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer, and dismissal of all personnel assigned to the school. 3. Assume administrative responsibility for all records and reports required regarding pupils, for the transfer of pupils within the school, and the promotion of pupils. 4. Have the authority to discipline students up to and including the suspension of students from school or from a school bus as provided in Florida Statute 1003.32 5. Enforce the Broward County School Code of Student Conduct.
Meinsen, Brittnany	Assistant Principal	<p>Math Students With Disabilities 21st Century RTI Life Skills- All Initiatives ESE Paras Graduation Pre-Planning Week Staff Development School Improvement School Advisory Con. Freshmen Invasion Substitutes Women of Tomorrow United Way Textbooks Library Media Top 5% Ceremony Alumni Events Job Coach Student Obligations Harvest Drive Teacher Certification</p>
Smith, Nadine	Reading Coach	Literacy coach for all 9-12 grade students. Provided support for English and Reading teachers while increasing student proficiency.

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.

The main process for involving stakeholders in the input of school improvement plan is through the schools School Advisory Council meetings. Meetings are advertised through school websites, social media, and parent link calls a minimum of two weeks in advance for each meeting. On the school website all meetings and times are posted for the year. Through these meetings each area of the school is discussed with all stakeholders having an opportunity to speak out and give input to improve the school's culture and increase student improvement in all academic areas.

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 is monitored throughout the year. At each School Advisory Council meeting data is presented to stakeholders to have the opportunity to give insight and make changes to continue to strive to increase student proficiency and improve the school culture. Each month each department meets and will analyze their data individually to make changes for their specific departments on the school improvement plan. Teams will collaborate and monitor plans to see if students are benefiting from each practice in the place.

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	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) 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: B 2018-19: B 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*	36	50	50	38	52	51	39		
ELA Learning Gains				46			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			33		
Math Achievement*	18	36	38	24	41	38	18		
Math Learning Gains				48			16		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			13		
Science Achievement*	41	60	64	35	35	40	38		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	66	66	62	51	48	48		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	92	90	89	98	54	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	61	61	65	59	66	67	64		
ELP Progress	63	50	45	51			46		

** 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	553
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	98

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	38	Yes	4	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	62			
BLK	50			
HSP	53			
MUL	53			
PAC				

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%
WHT	54			
FRL	51			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	53			
BLK	49			
HSP	51			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	50			

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	36			18			41	57		92	61	63
SWD	23			4			29	42		34	6	
ELL	7			11			35	38		53	7	63
AMI												
ASN	53			31			50	63		80	6	
BLK	33			15			41	52		59	7	54
HSP	36			18			38	61		63	7	66

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
MUL	44			14				60		55	5	
PAC												
WHT	39			23			50	62		56	6	
FRL	30			16			40	56		60	7	64

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	38	46	38	24	48	54	35	62		98	59	51
SWD	18	35	31	12	34	44	26	33		90	40	
ELL	14	43	48	14	36	57	24	43		97	49	51
AMI												
ASN	44	43		29	46		25	68		100	72	
BLK	37	45	32	23	51	59	33	56		98	56	
HSP	38	48	44	24	46	51	36	64		98	59	50
MUL	60	38		22	50					100	82	
PAC												
WHT	44	49	15	25	47		41	69		93	60	
FRL	36	46	35	23	48	52	33	58		97	60	58

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	39	40	33	18	16	13	38	48		95	64	46
SWD	15	32	31	11	14	11	21	29		90	36	
ELL	19	40	41	12	21	18	31	48		90	50	46
AMI												
ASN	54	60		38	33		55	69		100	70	
BLK	34	36	29	14	9	5	33	42		99	57	25
HSP	39	40	38	16	17	20	38	53		92	67	51
MUL	46	55		36	20			62		93	79	
PAC												
WHT	51	46	25	34	28	18	50	35		95	73	

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
FRL	38	40	36	18	16	12	33	45		96	63	44

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

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

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

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	38%	49%	-11%	50%	-12%
09	2023 - Spring	31%	49%	-18%	48%	-17%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	15%	48%	-33%	50%	-35%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	25%	46%	-21%	48%	-23%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	63%	-25%	63%	-25%

HISTORY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	62%	-8%	63%	-9%

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.

Based on the data students with disabilities are performing the lowest in all tested areas. With this subgroup there are a few contributing factors to last year's low performance and the past trends with this subgroup. First the majority of the students with disabilities population have reading, writing and math skills far below grade level. Facilitators and teachers are working heavily with this population to increase their skills to bring them up to grade level standard. On top of this many of these students also suffer from a deficiency on the behavior and emotional side which can disrupt learning inside the classroom and with one-on-one sessions with their facilitators.

Another component that showed the lowest performance this past year was Algebra 1. This is a new trend compared to the previous year there was a strong increase in student proficiency and learning gains.

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

Based on the data, the area that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was student achievement on the US History exam. In the 2022 school year 62% of students that took the US history exam reached a proficient score. There was an 8% decline with only 54% of students passing the exam in the 2023 school year. A contributing factor can be aligned to the decline in reading proficiency of the students. Teachers will be increasing extended learning opportunities to increase student rigor and achievement for the upcoming school year.

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.

Based on the data, the area that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the Algebra 1 BEST assessment. The state average has 25% of students achieving a level three, 13% with a level four and 12% reaching a level 5. McArthur High school fell short and had only 14% of the students reaching level three, 1% level 4 and 1% level 5. In total the state average 50% of students reaching a proficiency score where McArthur only had 16%, being a 34% difference from the state average. A large contributor to the difference in math scores from a previous year is that there are no longer any learning gains incorporated in the math scores. In the past years we had almost 50% of the students in Algebra 1 achieving a learning gain. Algebra 1 has had a trend of being a deficiency area for our students with many students having to attend extended learning opportunities to achieve a passing score on the state assessment. However, for the 2022 school year there had been an 8% gain in proficiency. Unfortunately, the proficiency level did drop 3% overall in math for the 2023 school year.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in science, specifically the biology exam. There was an increase of 3% to have 38% of the students achieve a level three or higher in Biology assessment for the 2023 school year. An action that our school took was our literacy coach incorporated science words throughout the year to build students vocabulary in biology. There were also multiple extended learning opportunities during and after school to remediate students that were struggling on common formative assessments.

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.

Our highest priority for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase student proficiency and overall, the school improvement is focusing on students with disabilities, math especially Algebra 1, US history, acceleration classes, and our 10th grade FAST exam.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Students with disabilities is a subgroup in crucial need per the data reviewed. It is the only subgroup consistently scoring below 40% proficiency of the Federal Percent of Points Index. This is now the fourth year that this subgroup is continuing to perform lower than any other subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, McArthur High School will increase the Federal Percent of Points Index of Students With Disabilities by 2%, from 36%, as measured by the 2024 state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

McArthur High School's ESE department will monitor students with disabilities in collaboration with content teachers through data analyzation on formative assessments throughout the year. Facilitators, ESE specialists, guidance counselors and administrators will meet bi-weekly to review students with IEP and RTI.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Meinsen (brittany.meinsen@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.)

Students will meet with their assigned support facilitator weekly to receive individualized support in content areas they are struggling in. They will also meet in small groups to enhance standards they are consistently not showing proficiency in. Support facilitators will push into tested area to continue to support students and teachers to increase student content knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Allowing space and time for collaboration will in turn give students a quiet space to focus and allow their support facilitator to monitor their progress and provide individualized support. Pushing into content area will allow for small group instruction and focusing on specialized instruction for students that need remediation.

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.

1. Identify ESE Students that are falling below proficiency level within the first month using formal common assesments.
2. Separate ESE facilitators caseload based on student needs. Analyzing the data based on common

formative assessments to see where students are needing remediation

3. Provide additional support options for pull-outs, push-in, afterschool tutoring, and computer resources
4. Formative and summative assessments from teachers are given continuously to determine the type of remediation needed for students with the ESE facilitator implementing support
5. Based on the data in the students' annual IEP meetings and interim reports the ESE facilitators and teachers will continuously adjust students plans.
6. Meeting bi-weekly to review RTI and how to support students.

Person Responsible: Alfred Broomfield (alfred.broomfield@browardschools.com)

By When: ESE facilitators will be working year-round with the ESE specialist, counselors, and administration. Bi-weekly meetings will be held to discuss RTI beginning at the start of the 2023 school year with support thru May 2024.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

Early warning system data, when used correctly, is a great component to increase not only student proficiency across all content areas but increase students' health and emotional wellbeing. During the 22-23 school year, our data shows that 15% of 9-12 graders had a course failure in ELA and 13% has a course failure in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024 students that were identified in the RTI system will increase a minimum of one letter grade in the class that they were identified in based on the previous report card from the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The RTI team will meet bi-weekly to discuss each student individually and create a specific plan to make adjustments for the student to be successful. Students will be monitored throughout the year with the support of the teachers and administration to provide them with the instruction they need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Meinsen (brittany.meinsen@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.)

Response to intervention is defined as the change in behavior or performance as a function of an intervention. The response to intervention (RTI) model is a multi-tiered approach to providing services and interventions to students at increasing levels of intensity based on progress monitoring and data analysis. Rate of progress over time is used to make important educational decisions, including determination of eligibility for exceptional education services

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The RTI model has been proven to be effective for students when used properly. This model use intervention before a student has failed and instead places support to allow them to be succesful in areas they may be deficient in.

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.

1. Teachers will be trained how to complete an RTI referral.
2. Support Teams will be selected to support students and analyze their assessment data.
3. Support Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss students and analyze data.

4. Data will be analyzed from summative and formative assessments to determine if strategies are successful or if more intervention is needed.

Person Responsible: Brittany Meinsen (brittany.meinsen@browardschools.com)

By When: RTI team will meet Bi-weekly to identify new students and monitor students for success thru May 2024.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

This area was identified as a crucial need, because The ELA achievement went down a percentage in 2022 from 2021. Both the learning gains and the lowest 25 % learning gains are below 50%. Only one subgroup is above 50% achievement in ELA with students with disabilities and ELL having the lowest proficiency scores. ELA is the core component for student success across multiple other content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, McArthur's proficiency in 9th and 10th grade overall FAST PM 3 scores will increase 2% from 34% to 36%.

Monitoring:

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

Students' assessment data will be analyzed and monitored each quarter to determine levels of students' proficiency and areas for remediation. Teachers will also administer formative and summative assessments to assess students' needs and growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Meinsen (brittany.meinsen@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.)

The literacy coach will support targeted students in need of remediation through push in and pull-out services based on BEST standards and common formative assessments. Also, the literacy coach will work individually with teachers to help increase the quality of instruction delivered, and help them analyze data within subgroups to make real time decisions for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small-group instruction for students, through push-in and pull-out support, provides opportunities for flexible and differentiated learning. Collaboration amongst educational professionals builds healthy peer relationships among teachers and provides them with the professional and emotional support they need.

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.

1. Students will take a diagnostic formative assessment in their reading and English classes.
2. Within the first month of school students will sit for the FAST exam.
3. Teachers and literacy coach will analyze the diagnostic and other relevant student assessment data.
4. Teachers and literacy coach will create individualized and whole class plans for student achievement.

5. Literacy coach will pull out students and push into classrooms based on data.

8. Literacy coach will guide and work with teachers in developing curriculum based on decision making tools and data.

Person Responsible: Nadine Smith (nadine.smith@browardschools.com)

By When: Ongoing thru June 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 School Advisory Council is in charge of reviewing improvement funding allocations and ensuring resources are allocated based on the needs and the school improvement plan for student success. The council meets the first Monday of each month. Each year at the second meeting new members are voted in to have the responsibility of allocating funds. The council makes up different stakeholders for McArthur High school including but not limited to students, teachers, staff, parents, community liaison. Each specific subgroup is represented in the council to ensure equality. Each month the School Improvement Plan is reviewed and student data analyzed to identify the needs of the student body. As well, new initiatives are monitored to determine the success of each program. Different proposals are brought forth to the meeting which are then reviewed, discussed and voted on to ensure it will have a direct positive impact on student learning and to the positive learning environment of the school.