

Broward County Public Schools

Driftwood Middle 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	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	18
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Driftwood Middle School

2751 N 70TH TER, 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.

Driftwood Middle School, Magnet Academy of Health and Wellness, empower students to promote healthy and positive and choices to ensure healthy lifestyles to maximizes their academic potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Driftwood Middle School strives to provide a program that will allow each child to develop to his/her fullest potential. Driftwood vision is to forge strong, positive connections with students so they can achieve independence, build confidence, and gain academic knowledge. Driftwood provides students with a variety of opportunities to learn, grow, and thrive.

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
Williams, Steven	Principal	Exercise proactive leadership in promoting the vision and mission of the District's Strategic Plan. Overall school operations and student performance.
Bello, Raheela	Assistant Principal	Work collaboratively to develop, implement and monitor an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessment.
Mostal, Jillian	Assistant Principal	Provide administrative support to faculty and staff. Work collaboratively to develop, implement and monitor an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments.
Rivera, Cristina	Assistant Principal	Provide administrative support to faculty and staff. Work collaboratively to develop, implement and monitor an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments.

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.

Stakeholders have the opportunity to engage in the SIP development process through our School Advisory Council meetings, school communication links via Parentlink, and news letters in multiple languages. Their input provided feedback and recommendations to modify policies and procedures.

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 SIP is regularly monitored through our School Advisory Council Meetings, recommended changes are discussed and reviewed during this time to ensure that achievement gaps are being addressed. This process is implemented monthly and further discussed with all stakeholders.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	86%
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) Native American Students (AMI) 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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
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	103	133	130	366	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	128	96	320	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	2	22	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	146	126	418	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	157	101	361	
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	1	1	2	

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	127	182	133	442

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	2	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8

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	108	124	148	380	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	97	54	240	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5	8	36	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	16	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	123	162	407	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	119	159	443	
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	2	0	2	

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	162	137	165	464

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	19	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	20

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	108	124	148	380	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	97	54	240	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5	8	36	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	16	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	123	162	407	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	119	159	443	
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	2	0	2	

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	162	137	165	464

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	19	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	20

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*	43	53	49	45	54	50	46		
ELA Learning Gains				49			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			30		
Math Achievement*	41	56	56	39	41	36	35		
Math Learning Gains				58			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			18		
Science Achievement*	40	50	49	38	52	53	39		
Social Studies Achievement*	59	67	68	69	63	58	45		
Middle School Acceleration	66	70	73	79	51	49	46		
Graduation Rate					49	49			
College and Career Acceleration					70	70			
ELP Progress	48	42	40	50	74	76	44		

** 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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	297
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	33	Yes	4	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI	25	Yes	1	1
ASN	63			
BLK	45			
HSP	48			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	56			
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	31	Yes	3	2
ELL	46			
AMI	43			
ASN	70			
BLK	50			
HSP	51			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	52			

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	43			41			40	59	66			48
SWD	24			22			26	41	44		6	38
ELL	29			30			22	51	58		6	48
AMI	20			30							2	
ASN	46			54			59	91	64		5	
BLK	42			38			33	48	63		5	
HSP	43			40			37	61	64		6	45
MUL	43			43			50				3	
PAC												
WHT	48			45			53	62	70		5	
FRL	42			38			37	58	61		6	45

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	45	49	36	39	58	57	38	69	79			50
SWD	25	34	28	18	47	48	11	39				29
ELL	38	49	36	29	50	49	27	61	73			50
AMI	29			31	70							
ASN	69	67		68	65		52	73	93			
BLK	39	47	35	31	56	64	37	67	76			
HSP	44	48	37	39	57	52	35	68	76			51
MUL	40	53		24	65		40					
PAC												
WHT	54	51	37	47	56	67	45	80	86			
FRL	43	49	39	37	57	61	34	67	78			51

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	46	42	30	35	23	18	39	45	46			44
SWD	27	29	20	19	23	19	17	39	25			30
ELL	37	46	43	31	24	27	17	36	44			44
AMI	40			20								
ASN	70	59		65	27		79	67	78			
BLK	39	36	19	25	13	10	33	51	41			
HSP	43	43	33	34	25	21	36	40	48			41
MUL	58	36		53	29							
PAC												
WHT	61	44	35	44	28	18	47	43	40			
FRL	43	41	30	33	23	18	39	41	47			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
07	2023 - Spring	38%	49%	-11%	47%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	49%	-6%	47%	-4%
06	2023 - Spring	35%	50%	-15%	47%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	39%	54%	-15%	54%	-15%
07	2023 - Spring	29%	51%	-22%	48%	-19%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	46%	-7%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	27%	38%	-11%	44%	-17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	48%	39%	50%	37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	46%	54%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	63%	23%	63%	23%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	64%	-7%	66%	-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.

The data component which showed the lowest performance was Science. Contributing factors to last year's low performance is due to missing foundational skills for our level 1, level 2, and ELL students.

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

The data components which showed the greatest decline from the previous year was English Language Arts and Science with a 1% decrease. Contributing factors to last year's low performance due to lacking foundational skills for our level 1, level 2, and ELL students.

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 data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average is Science with a decrease of 15%. Contributing factors to last year's low performance due to a lack of foundational skills of our level 1, level 2, and ELL students. Our Extended Learning Opportunity Program (ELO) shifted from in school hours to after school hours. As a result, the number of students participating in the program declined drastically due to transportation being an issue.

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

The data component with the most improvement was Social Studies with an increase of 24%. Actions taken in this area were targeted extended learning opportunities. Students participated in enrichment and remediation activities focused on their areas of need with specific teachers. Teachers were also provided professional development to improve the implementation of strategies.

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

Potential areas of concern are Level 1 on statewide ELA Assessment and absent 10% or more days.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming year are increase in ELA, increase in Math, and increase in Science performance.

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.

The 2022-2023 data indicates that we have a significant amount of students scoring a Level 1 in ELA and a similar amount of students with 10% or more days absent from school. This correlation is an area of focus for us.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024 we will have a 10% increase in attendance and a 10% increase in ELA as evidenced by FAST results and attendance records.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring through formal (FAST PM1, 2, and 3) and informal assessments (Reading and Phonics Inventory and Growth Measure) and informal means of lunch bunch to motivate attendance will be used to monitor the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cristina Rivera (cristina.rivera@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.)

Implementation of Read 180 and Systems 44 reading curriculum and targeted instruction for students. Small group instruction and Project-Based Learning to increase student engagement will be implemented as well as Suite 360 for Lunch Bunch.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Individualized learning pathways for students in intensive reading to address areas of weakness, as well as Life Skills and Wellness activities.

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 take part in Professional Development regarding the Science of Reading throughout the school year.
- Authentic PLCs will occur to provide an opportunity for collaboration to improve teaching practices and discuss the academic performance of students.
- Administration and teachers will monitor the use of instructional programs and data to determine the effectiveness and decide if adjustments need to be made.

Person Responsible: Cristina Rivera (cristina.rivera@browardschools.com)

By When: Quarterly

#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.

2023 data indicates that Students with Disabilities (SWD) are the lowest performing subgroup for proficiency in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, SWD will have a 10% increase in proficiency in ELA as evidenced by FAST results.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring through formal (FAST PM1, 2, and 3) and informal assessments (Workshop Assessments) will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cristina Rivera (cristina.rivera@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.)

Implementation of individualized instruction based on areas of weakness will be provided to students. Small group instruction and Project-Based-Learning to increase student engagement will be implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Individualized learning pathways for students in ELA to address areas of weakness.

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 take part in Professional Development in the ELA B.E.S.T standards throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Cristina Rivera (cristina.rivera@browardschools.com)

By When: Quarterly

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 are conducted through collaboration of our stakeholders during our School Advisory Council meetings. School Accountability funds are announced at the monthly SAC meetings and stakeholders have a say in school needs and how the money can be spent through a member vote. The school monitors through the data of student usage and student performance. Data is discussed among teachers and staff to monitor student progression and effective use of funds.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Our school-wide School Improvement Plan is disseminated to stakeholders through our monthly School Advisory Council meetings. Upon which, stakeholders can access the completed School Improvement Plan (SIP) on the school's website page.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school plans to build positive relationships with all stakeholders through quarterly Curriculum parent night functions, Parent Training Academy, Annual Parent Seminar, School Advisory Council meetings, Parent, Teacher, Student Association meetings, as well as our annual Title 1 public meeting (Open House).

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Our school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help an enriched and accelerated curriculum by providing opportunities for teachers to engage in research and / or evidence-based professional development workshops in ELA / Reading and Math B.E.S.T standards in addition to identify strategies to support remediation and enrichment within the academic setting.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A