Northeast High School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Northeast High School

700 NE 56TH ST, Oakland Park, FL 33334

[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.

We will foster a safe environment for individual students to acquire life skills, both intellectual and personal, which will enable them to become self-directed learners both now and in the future. The expectation is for students to gain academic knowledge while cultivating the abilities necessary to evolve into a responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will have a peaceful, productive, and orderly learning environment that meets the academic, social, and developmental needs of all of our students. Our goal is to provide the highest quality programs that prepare students for a successful high school experience without the need for remediation.

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
Dykes, Jonathan	SAC Member	1. Works with students, parents, school staff, guidance counselors, and District Core Curriculum administrators to ensure that site reading literacy initiatives align with District and State initiatives for high-quality instruction and student achievement. 2. Teach students about political systems in ancient, historic, and modern times 3. Facilitates SAC meetings and inform the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities. 4. Coordinates, implements, and evaluates the social studies curriculum
White, Nadine	Reading Coach	1. Works with students, parents, school staff, guidance counselors, and District Core Curriculum administrators to ensure that site reading literacy initiatives align with District and State initiatives for high-quality instruction and student achievement. 2. Assist with improving and sustaining student achievement through literacy. 3. Enhance and refine literacy instruction and interventions. 4. Provide targeted instructional coaching and build capacity for literacy across the curriculum. 5. Develops the 9-12 Comprehensive reading plan. 6. Member of the curriculum council.
Sales, Dawn	Assistant Principal	1. Assists the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources. 2. Leads the social studies, fine arts, and physical education departments. 3. Oversees all physical plant operations, including facility maintenance. 4. Oversees transportation at the school level. 5. Oversees tenth-grade discipline. 6. Oversees acceleration through industry certification.
Valachovic, Anthony	Principal	To effectively perform the performance responsibilities using the following knowledge, skills and abilities by providing instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school; prepare and manage the school's budget and manage and inventory the school's assets; to read, interpret, follow and enforce the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and other state and federal laws; use effective interview techniques, coaching procedures, and evaluation procedures; enforce collective bargaining agreements; use effective public speaking skills, group dynamics, and interaction and problem solving skills; maintain a sensitivity to multicultural issues; perceive the impact of a decision on other components of the organization; communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, and through use of technology; and analyze and use data.
Beavers, Lecorey	Teacher, Adult	1. Works with students, parents, school staff, guidance counselors, and District Core Curriculum administrators to ensure that site reading literacy initiatives align with District and State initiatives for high-quality instruction and student achievement.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		2. Design and implement daily lesson plans for civics and government classes. 3. Maintaining PLC rosters 4. Verifying PLC enrollment 5. Participating in all webinars and trainings 6. Monitoring PLC Activity (attendance/minutes) 7. Closing your school's PLCs in May of each year

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 School Advisory Council (SAC) is the vehicle that is used to get the community, stakeholders, staff, students, families and businesses input on the School Improvement Plan. The SAC meetings are conducted as an open forum where all stakeholders have a voice and the council members vote on various agenda items. The school leadership team meets monthly to address the K-12 Reading Plan, analyze data in all content areas, and discuss ways to streamline testing to support and maximize academic achievement. Our teachers have quarterly input regarding our School-wide Positive Behavior Plan.

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))

In PLC's each core subject area team follows a common pacing guide and utilizes common formative assessments. The data gathered is used as an achievement monitoring tool to regularly provide teachers with valuable information on the progress and achievements of students. It's also used to make data-based decisions for adjusting instruction.
The ELL Liaison and the administrator for the SWD subgroup will be tasked to monitor and report the achievement progress of their respective departments.
The leadership team meets once a month to discuss the current progression toward our school's SIP goals. If the intended progress is not being made in any area, the team will collaborate and determine the cause of the lack of progress. They will devise a plan to address the issue(s) and increase progress toward the SIP goals and continuous success.

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	83%
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)* 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: I 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	36	50	50	35	52	51	37		
ELA Learning Gains				41			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			23		
Math Achievement*	14	36	38	14	41	38	12		
Math Learning Gains				37			13		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			17		
Science Achievement*	47	60	64	40	35	40	45		
Social Studies Achievement*	54	66	66	54	51	48	44		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	89	90	89	89	54	61	88		
College and Career Acceleration	34	61	65	39	66	67	47		
ELP Progress	54	50	45	48			35		

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	328
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	89

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	89

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	28	Yes	4	1
ELL	33	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	47			
MUL	23	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	44			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	37	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	42			
HSP	43			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	43			

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)

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			14			47	54		89	34	54
SWD	15			6			22	22		18	6	
ELL	17			10			38	13		24	7	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			14			44	51		24	6	
HSP	33			12			46	52		40	7	57
MUL	36			10							2	
PAC												
WHT	47			21			58	68		38	6	
FRL	35			13			40	49		31	7	53

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	35	41	37	14	37	54	40	54		89	39	48
SWD	19	32	28	13	42	54	12	24		82	13	
ELL	13	40	41	7	34	42	18	30		86	45	48
AMI												
ASN	80	50										
BLK	29	40	33	10	38	56	36	55		88	33	
HSP	33	41	44	13	32	47	41	46		91	43	43
MUL				27	60							
PAC												
WHT	44	45	32	26	46	64	48	75		84	44	
FRL	32	40	35	12	36	54	36	53		90	38	50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2019-20**	**C & C Accel 2019-20**	**ELP Progress**
All Students	37	35	23	12	13	17	45	44		88	47	35
SWD	15	22	18	4	13	19	17	28		83	36	
ELL	19	26	25	11	19	21	33	24		77	36	35
AMI												
ASN	50	54								100	80	
BLK	33	33	18	11	10	9	36	32		89	47	
HSP	34	33	26	13	14	25	43	47		88	42	31
MUL	40									85	36	
PAC												
WHT	51	44	25	17	14		68	57		81	55	
FRL	34	33	21	11	13	20	41	43		90	43	33

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	39%	49%	-10%	50%	-11%
09	2023 - Spring	35%	49%	-14%	48%	-13%

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	17%	46%	-29%	48%	-31%

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

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	62%	-11%	63%	-12%

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.

Algebra was our lowest performing component with a 14% in proficiency. Unscheduled days off due to hurricane/ weather disrupted the consistency of learning and teachers had to take additional time to re-teach lessons. This limited the time to reteach. In addition, three teachers under performed. They did not respond to trainings that were provided to support their instruction and student learning. These low performing teachers had a significant impact from teaching close to 40% of our students. These teachers had a below average passing rate of the students that they were in their classes.

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

History showed the greatest decline from the previous year dropping one point going from 53 to 52 to . Many juniors were reading retakes and struggled with reading. Unscheduled days off due to hurricane/ weather disrupted the consistency of learning and teachers had to take additional time to re-teach lessons. These unscheduled days total which were two days in September and another two days November. Although, it was only four days, many students did not return to school as soon as it was open. This lag in the students return to school had impact of students missing a week of school. This impact teaching by having by have almost a two week gap in learning, this resulted in reteaching the content was the interrupted by the storms and put us further behind on pacing guide. This resulted in some of the US history teachers not being able to cover complete the pacing guide before it was time for testing. Lastly, students used Reading Plus in previous years to assist with reading stamina and building comprehension skills. This resource also allowed teachers to assist students in target areas where they struggled this program was not available to use this 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.

Geometry had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state averaged 36% in proficiency while Northeast averaged 17% in proficiency, which is a 14 point difference. Factors that contributed to this gap were student and teacher attendance, staffing issues, and in one class there was a substitute the entire school year. The teacher performance mentioned in answer one was also a factor.

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

Science showed the most improvement going from a proficiency of 39% in 2022 and improving to 45% in proficiency in 2023. Teacher collaboration was increased, they were meeting daily during common planning to analyze data, and there was the implementation and utilization of school-wide adopted teaching strategies.

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.

Science of Reading Training
Can Do Descriptors
11th Grade Mentoring Program
Attendance Committee
Dress Code/ Behavior (insubordination, class cuts, disruptive play, and fighting)

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.

Fifty percent of our students are absent for 10% or more calendar school days. In order for students to have academic success they need to attend class daily. Our students, particularly ELL and SWD subgroups, have barriers affecting their school attendance. This school year our newly formed attendance initiative is focused on providing supports to assist in removing barriers. We believe that if we continue to celebrate student achievement and promote a culture that cares and uplifts students, we will see a positive shift in our school climate. This positive shift will promote a joy of learning and an excitement to come to school. The opening of our new building and classrooms will also bring a "fresh" excitement that will motivate students to attend all of their classes.

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

The number of students with attendance below 90% increased from the 2020-2021 school year to the 2021-2022 school year by 56%.

By May 25, 2024, the number of students with attendance below 90% will decrease by 10% as measured by BCPS's Early Warning Indicators.

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

The newly formed attendance committee (school counselor, guidance team, ESE department, and administration) will regularly check attendance of students who have shown a history of absenteeism in the previous year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@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.)

Pilot 11th grade mentoring program - the purpose is to monitor graduation requirements, cultivate responsible behavior and accountability. If successful it will be extended to other grades.

RTI is also an evidence-based way for addressing attendance issues, as well as Tier 2 and 3 interventions, which usually involve providing supportive services, such as counseling and attendance monitoring of students, as well as academic assistance, for students who are having difficulties with schoolwork, which discourage students for attending school.

Strengthen Family Partnerships -Addressing family issues which negatively impact attendance: for example, helping families to obtain resources such as housing assistance, or transportation, if those issues impact attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are aware of the difficulties of some students wanting or being able to attend school daily for a variety of reasons. We believe that addressing the reasons for the absences both, internal and external, we will be able to improve student attendance and school motivation. The SIP plan will be used as a model for improving school attendance and setting expectations.

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.

-Finalizing the Attendance Committee
-Meet with attendance committee to discuss school goals and data
-Create an intervention for students with less than 90% attendance

Person Responsible: Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 9/30/2023

Attendance committee meets to review current data and modify plan if needed.

Person Responsible: Johnathan Dykes (johnathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 10/24/23, 1/23/24 and 4/2/24

Attendance committee meets to review current data and evaluate the impact of the year's interventions.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 5/23/2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

Per the 2021-2022 Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) data, English Language Learners were at 37%, which is below the 41% requirement to be on track for achievement. As we reviewed our data only two subgroups did not meet the 41% federal requirement. This identified area of need has a school wide affect being that ELL students have courses in math and ELA. Furthermore, this group has been below the required FPPI for 3 consecutive years.

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

By June 2024, the Federal Percent of Points Index for English Language Learners will increase from 37% to 41% or higher that is required to be on track for achievement.

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

ELL student progress will be tracked by teachers. The person responsible for monitoring will meet with the teacher to discuss progress and if there needs to be an changes to the plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@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.)

There are two evidence based interventions that will be used the first is questioning to check for understanding. The reason for this intervention is to check for the student's understanding. This will allow teachers to identify students that need remediation fast than wait for a formal assessment. The second intervention is meaningful practice. Students will be given plenty of opportunities to strengthen the lesson they learned through meaningful practice, not busy work.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The reason for having clear lesson goals is so that the students are aware of what they should be learning. This makes them more invested in their own learning. Also, students will be given plenty of opportunities to strengthen the lesson they learn through meaningful practice. Learning occurs when we move information from working memory to long-term memory, and practice helps with this process.

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.

Administrator meets with the ELL Department to discuss an intervention plan for our SWDs.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 9/30/2023

The point person meets with the ELL department to discuss student achievement since the interventions have been applied and modify the plan if needed.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 10/27/2023, 1/6/24, 4/2/23

The point person meets with the ELL department to discuss student data and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 5/28/23

#3. 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.

Per the 2021-2022 Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) data, Students with Disabilities were at 32%, which is below the 41% requirement to be on track for achievement. As we reviewed our data only two subgroups did not meet the 41% federal requirement. This identified area of need has a school wide affect being that the SWD have courses in math and ELA. Furthermore, this group has been below the required FPPI for 3 consecutive years.

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

By June 2024, Students with Disabilities will increase from 32% to 41% or higher that is required to be on track for achievement as evidenced by Federal Percent of Points Index data.

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

Teachers will administer monthly common formative assessments, and quarterly data chats will be conducted with their administrator.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@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.)

There are two evidence based interventions that will be used the first is questioning to check for understanding. The reason for this intervention is to check for the student's understanding. This will allow teachers to identify students that need remediation fast than wait for a formal assessment. The second is summarizing new learning in a graphic way. Graphic organizers help students organize their thoughts and construct new meaning from what they are reading or learning about. This allows students to visualize ideas and concepts and see how they fit together.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The reason for questioning to check for understanding is that students with disabilities may not comprehend the material the first time it is introduced. Questioning before moving on give teachers an opportunity to gauge how much the student understood from that portion of lesson. Summarizing new learning in graphic way allows the students to interpret new information in visual way. For many students having information presented in multiple ways helps with retention.

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 3 - Promising 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.

An Administrator meets with the ESE department to discuss our school's SIP goals data and intervention plan for ESE students.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 9/30/2023

A point person meets with the ESE department to discuss student achievement since the interventions have been applied and modify the plan if needed.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 10/26/2023

Point person meets with the ESE department to discuss student achievement and modify the plan if needed.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 1/6/24 and 4/2/24

Point person meets with the ESE department to discuss student achievement and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Dykes (jonathan.dykes@browardschools.com)

By When: 5/28/24

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 accountability funds are used to support student achievement and learning. A needs assessment is taken each year at our school. The students' needs are identified through a needs assessment and observations are made by students, staff, and stakeholders. Staff members propose materials, programs and other things that are believed to be helpful to students and their achievement. To address those needs, requests are brought to the attention of School Advisory Council, discussed and then brought to the floor for at vote. If the vote is successful, the money will be allocated to that endeavor.