

Broward County Public Schools

Whiddon Rodgers Education Center 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Whiddon Rodgers Education Center

700 SW 26TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33315

[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.

Our mission is to provide appropriate alternative educational strategies and resources that support social emotional growth and instill a desire to become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to become a nationally recognized school of excellence in innovative educational alternatives designed to prepare students for college and careers.

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
Howard, Wylie	Principal	The principal primary role is to lead the school community, set purposeful goals for the school, and work to meet the academic needs of all students. Oversee school operations, school budget, discipline, and hiring and ensure that each staff member is efficiently producing positive results.
Morris, Sharnett	Assistant Principal	Principal Instructional Oversight, Co-High School Programs, Back-Up Middle School Programs, Back-Up Workforce/BSO Programs ELA, Guidance, Social Studies, CTE, Electives, ESE, ESOL, Education Support Professionals
Previl, Dania	Behavior Specialist	Monitor the State and District School Improvement Plan
Schubert, Garrett	Behavior Specialist	Monitor the State and District School Improvement Plan.

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.

Each stakeholder's role in our School Advisory Council is significant. Stakeholder involvement will be cultivated through consistent communication with the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, and students. Communication methods will entail email, announcements, robocalls, and the use of parentlink. SIP development requires consistent input and recommendations from students, teachers, staff, and community leaders. All stakeholder's values and opinions will be valued and taken into

consideration during the SIP development process. Input from students, teachers, staff, and families will be used to improve the school improvement plan's objectives and its implementation with the purpose to improve student achievement.

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))

Each month, our School Advisory Council meeting will discuss a different plan from the SIP. Our School Advisory Meeting's purpose is to regularly monitor the selected plan for the month and discuss effective planning. Making an impact on student achievement is the foundation and purpose of the SIP. Stakeholders will gain the opportunity to depict the areas of strengths and weaknesses of each plan aligned with the state's academic standards. Every month, the SIP will be reviewed and revised by strategic discussions during our School Advisory Meeting to ensure continuous student improvement.

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 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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.	
School Improvement Rating History	2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	50	75	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	30	49	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	21	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	22	30	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	32	50	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	31	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	45	68

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	26

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	76	755	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	32	173	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	38	189	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	36	97	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	22	126	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	73	568

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	226
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	26	200

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	76	90	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	32	37	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	38	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	36	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	22	33	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	73	88

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	26	32

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*		50	50		52	51	7		
ELA Learning Gains							23		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		36	38		41	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		60	64		35	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		66	66		51	48			
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	25	90	89	28	54	61	33		
College and Career Acceleration	10	61	65	12	66	67	6		
ELP Progress	30	50	45	27			39		

** 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	22
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	65
Total Components for the Federal Index	3

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	25

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	22
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	67
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	28

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	39	Yes	4	
ELL	22	Yes	4	4
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	16	Yes	4	4
HSP	26	Yes	4	4
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	0	Yes	4	4
FRL	22	Yes	4	4

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	18	Yes	3	3
ELL	26	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	3	3
HSP	25	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	29	Yes	3	3
FRL	20	Yes	3	3

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										25	10	30
SWD											1	
ELL											2	30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										5	2	
HSP											2	28
MUL												
PAC												
WHT											1	
FRL										11	3	30

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										28	12	27
SWD										35	0	
ELL										25		27
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										30	9	36
HSP										25		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										29		
FRL										27	9	23

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	7	23								33	6	39
SWD										37	7	
ELL										45	5	39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	7	23								37	6	36
HSP										14		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										20		
FRL	7	23								34	6	38

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	0%	49%	-49%	50%	-50%
07	2023 - Spring	10%	49%	-39%	47%	-37%
08	2023 - Spring	3%	49%	-46%	47%	-44%
09	2023 - Spring	3%	49%	-46%	48%	-45%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	21%	51%	-30%	48%	-27%
08	2023 - Spring	14%	46%	-32%	55%	-41%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	4%	38%	-34%	44%	-40%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	4%	48%	-44%	50%	-46%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	0%	46%	-46%	48%	-48%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	6%	63%	-57%	63%	-57%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	64%	*	66%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	0%	62%	-62%	63%	-63%

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 2021-2022 Federal Index Data percentage comparisons, ELL learners were the lowest-performing data component. The Federal Index Data percentage in 2020-21 SY was 30% and in 2021-2022 it was reduced to 26%. The language barrier played a critical factor in last year's low performance. An additional contributing factor to last school year's low performance was the result of students' non-attendance and the high number of tardy students 2022-2023 SY.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is also the English Language Learners. The language barrier played a critical factor in last year's low performance. An additional contributing factor to last school year's low performance was a result of students' non-attendance and the high number of tardy students in 2022-2023 SY.

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 graduation rate of 28% had the greatest gap when compared to the state average of 91.2%. There are several factors contributing to this expansive gap. Student attendance is the primary barrier for many students to accomplish graduation requirements. Such absences deplete students from the learning process and hinder academic growth.

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

Based on the 2021-22 Federal Index Percentage, our Hispanic students showed the most improvement. Results indicated that in previous years, 14% of Hispanic Students were above the 41% Federal Index Percentage. Based on the 2021-2022 Federal Index, 25% of Hispanic students were positioned above the 41% Federal Index Percentage. Latinos in Action supported our Hispanic students by providing them with content-rich information regarding academics, counseling, and motivation that they need to be successful. As a result, student attendance for Hispanics increased.

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

Based on the Early Warning System Data for 2022-23, one area of concern is 7th and 8th-grade students absent 10% or more school days. The data shows 75 students were absent 10% or more on school days.

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

1. Student Attendance
2. Student Engagement
3. Student Tutoring
4. Student Mentoring
5. Student Leadership

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 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.

Based on the 2022-23 Early Warning System (EWS) data, our middle school students were identified as a critical need for absenteeism. Seventy-five of our 7th and 8th-grade students were absent 10% or more school days. Forty-nine (49) of our 7th and 8th-grade students were suspended one or more times. Fifty (50) of our middle school student population received a level 1 on their ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By April 2024, the attendance of 7th and 8th-grade students will improve on their absenteeism by 10% by increasing the use of positive interventions and support.

Monitoring:

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

The progress of 7th and 8th-grade students for absenteeism will be monitored by weekly collaboration and check-ins with middle school students and support staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dania Previl (dania.previl@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.)

Research shows students who are assigned to an adult staff with the purpose of monitoring progress leave a positive impact on students. Checking in with student weekly will be an evidence-based strategy to improve the attendance of middle school students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Middle school students struggle with being present and reporting to school. By checking in with students, staff can attempt to understand the barriers specific to each student that keeps them from attending school. Staff can also provide helpful recommendations or referrals to further assist students to reach their academic goals.

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.

Teacher makes phone call to parent and documents call in Pinnacle.

Person Responsible: Sharnett Morris (sharnett.morris@browardschools.com)

By When: Starting August 21st to the end of the school year.

Teacher notifies the attendance committee via email and the student is placed on an attendance agreement.

Person Responsible: Sharnett Morris (sharnett.morris@browardschools.com)

By When: Starting August 21st by the end of the school year

Social worker contacts the parent or home visit and documents in BASIS.

Person Responsible: Sharnett Morris (sharnett.morris@browardschools.com)

By When: Starting August 21st by the end of school year

Students who model good attendance can receive HERO points in return for rewards/snacks from the school store.

Person Responsible: Garrett Schubert (garrett.schubert@browardschools.com)

By When: Starting August 21st throughout the end of the school year.

#2. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation**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.

Based on the 2022-23 Early Warning System (EWS) data, the graduation rate is at 28%. The goal is to increase the graduation rate by 5%. By 2024-2025, the graduation rate should increase from 28% to 33%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By August 2024, the high school graduation rate will increase by 5% by increasing the use of positive interventions and support.

Monitoring:

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

The progress of the high school graduation rate will be monitored by the students' success in credit recovery classes and preparation for state-required assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharnett Morris (sharnett.morris@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.)

Pullouts and Push Ins will be incorporated in classrooms by the ESSER coach. Additionally, the target graduation committee will provide support to learners with 3 or 4 credits left. The literacy coach will share reading strategies and best practices with each academic department. FIYAH mentoring program will enable teachers to check in with students to check on their academic progress and support them as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows students who are assigned to an adult staff with the purpose of monitoring progress leave a positive impact on students. Checking in with student weekly will be an evidence-based strategy to improve the attendance of middle school students. Additional academic support will help students to show academic growth.

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.

Target graduation committee members will meet each month to help further support students' academic needs. Check-in with seniors will be accomplished to track academic progress.

Person Responsible: Sharnett Morris (sharnett.morris@browardschools.com)

By When: Starting August 21st throughout the end of the school year.

Students will be informed to sign up for ACT/SAT and prepare for alternative assessments to increase high school graduation rate. Students will also be able to increase meeting their high school credit requirement.

Person Responsible: Sharnett Morris (sharnett.morris@browardschools.com)

By When: Starting August 21st throughout the end of the school year.

Students who model outstanding academic achievement can receive HERO points in return for rewards/ snacks from the school store.

Person Responsible: Garrett Schubert (garrett.schubert@browardschools.com)

By When: Starting August 21st to the end of the school year.

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 process to review school improvement funding allocations occurs each month during scheduled school advisory school meetings. Each month, the school advisory council's committee members review the agenda. The agenda includes the current balance and items to vote on. To ensure resources are allocated based on needs, the committee members will review the purpose, rationale, and the relation between the motion and student achievement. A vote will take place to ensure resources are a good fit for student progress and school improvement.