

Broward County Public Schools

Plantation High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
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

Plantation High School

6901 NW 16TH ST, Plantation, FL 33313

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Plantation High School is to meet the needs of all its students by providing an education balanced by academic excellence, career pathways, community service and extracurricular activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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
Bristol , Parinaz	Principal	The principal is the leader and ensures that all processes and procedures are in place to support student achievement and that those process and procedures are followed school-wide, specifically as it relates to our SIP. The principal also and manage the administration of all work related to students, teachers and staff.
Roberts, Gia	Assistant Principal	Ms. Roberts is the assist principal is responsible for the different components of the School Improvement Plan. In the absence of the principal, she is responsible for ensuring that all processes and procedures are in place to support student achievement and that those process and procedures are followed school-wide, specifically as it relates to our SIP.
Andre, Alin	Assistant Principal	Mr. Andre is the assist principal is responsible for the different components of the guidance department. In the absence of the principal, she is responsible for ensuring that all processes and procedures are in place to support student achievement and that those process and procedures are followed school-wide.
Major, Horatio	Assistant Principal	Mr. Major is the assist principal is responsible for the different components of the master schedule. In the absence of the principal, she is responsible for ensuring that all processes and procedures are in place to support student achievement and that those process and procedures are followed school-wide.
Rios, Sylvia	Assistant Principal	Ms. Rios is the assist principal is responsible for the different components of the 12th grade graduation requirement and the ESOL department. In the absence of the principal, she is responsible for ensuring that all processes and procedures are in place to support student achievement and that those process and procedures are followed school-wide.

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.

Information regarding our school-wide literacy plan and our RtI plan will be shared with all stakeholders. Students, families, business, and community leaders will be notified through our SAC and SAF meetings as well as through our school newsletter. Our teachers, staff, and leadership team will meet to discuss, share, and training staff on the SIP development process at the beginning of the school year.

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 will be monitored and reviewed monthly during leadership meetings. The SIP will also be reviewed by each semester at the SAC/SAF meetings. Based on continuous data analysis from various departments and school-wide assessments, the SIP will be reviewed and revised as needed to meet the needs of our targeted student groups as indicated within the plan.

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	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	91%
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	2021-22: C

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37	50	50	36	52	51	36		
ELA Learning Gains				43			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			31		
Math Achievement*	20	36	38	18	41	38	14		
Math Learning Gains				42			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			30		
Science Achievement*	44	60	64	37	35	40	39		
Social Studies Achievement*	55	66	66	54	51	48	49		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	90	90	89	95	54	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	43	61	65	49	66	67	59		
ELP Progress	51	50	45	38			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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	90

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	497
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	95

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	34	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	45			
HSP	52			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	56			

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%
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	32	Yes	2	
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	50			
BLK	44			
HSP	48			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	44			

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	37			20			44	55		90	43	51
SWD	18			7			23	29		14	6	
ELL	16			11			31	26		34	7	51
AMI												
ASN	85										1	
BLK	35			18			40	55		34	7	46
HSP	40			26			54	48		62	7	50
MUL	45			38						67	4	

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
PAC												
WHT	46			17			48	75		55	6	
FRL	33			18			41	52		39	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	36	43	30	18	42	55	37	54		95	49	38
SWD	18	26	20	10	29	39	24	38		97	22	
ELL	14	31	26	6	41	47	18	29		90	58	38
AMI												
ASN	53	55		23				70				
BLK	32	42	31	16	41	55	35	50		95	45	42
HSP	37	47	24	18	53	57	36	58		96	59	38
MUL	50	35					50					
PAC												
WHT	56	49		37	37		53	84		88	65	
FRL	31	42	33	15	40	54	34	50		95	49	36

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	36	39	31	14	20	30	39	49		96	59	35
SWD	21	32	31	16	22	24	26	42		93	32	
ELL	20	31	33	5	17	29	34	36		98	53	35
AMI												
ASN	68	63								100	86	
BLK	31	36	32	13	20	31	34	47		97	54	21
HSP	40	42	29	13	16	25	49	59		89	69	44
MUL	53	56		27	21			50		100	76	
PAC												
WHT	63	50		32	17		74	59		93	68	
FRL	32	37	30	13	18	29	34	48		96	57	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	37%	49%	-12%	50%	-13%
09	2023 - Spring	35%	49%	-14%	48%	-13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	17%	48%	-31%	50%	-33%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	46%	-25%	48%	-27%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	41%	63%	-22%	63%	-22%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	62%	-10%	63%	-11%

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 that showed the lowest performance is our Math Achievement Level. Even though this component had the lowest performance, based on the trends for the past three years, there has been consistent growth each year in this component. One factor contributing to last year's low performance was our 9th grade Algebra 1 students who did not have the foundational knowledge and therefore struggled conceptually. Eighty percent of all students taking Algebra 1 scored a level 1 or a level 2.

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 was the within our school's graduation rate. The graduation rate as calculated in 2022-2023 school-wide data represents the previous school year. The main factor that contributed to the decline is that this year's school grade is the first one fully calculated, since the pandemic where scoring rubrics and guidelines for all state test were restored. The graduation rate for the past three years reflected percentages that were calculated when tests were waived and/or passing scores were adjusted with respect to the learning declines that occurred as a result of school closure, online learning, or other learning gaps that occurred as a result of the Covid-19 Pandemic. The 2022-2023 graduation rate was 90%, which is a five percentage point drop when compared to the 2021-2022 school grade.

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 that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Geometry. The state average was 56 percent whereas our average was 21 percent. One factor contributing to the gap between state average and average at Plantation High School is the lack of conceptual and foundational knowledge that our students taking Geometry had.

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

While our Geometry scores showed the greatest gap between our school's scores and the state scores, our Math data component, along with our Science components both showed the most improvements. For example, our math scores have progressively increased over the past three years 2021 -14%, 2022 - 18%, and 2023 - 21%. Likewise, our Science scores show increase as well 2021 -39%, 2022 - 37%, and 2023 - 41%. Both groups improved by 3 percentage points in the last school year. Teachers and coaches worked with students worked through push-in/pull-outs, tutoring, interventions plans, and enrichment activities to remediated and enrich students based on progress monitoring data.

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

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

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

1. Improving learning gains with our students with disabilities.
2. Improving learning gains in our ELA lowest 25% component.
3. Increasing our ELA achievement percent.
4. Improving learning gains in our Math lowest 25% component.
3. Increasing our Math achievement percent.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

One of our areas of focus to improve student performance is with our students with disabilities. Our students with disabilities, as a group, have consistently struggled to meet grade levels proficiency in each of the school grade components.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, the percentage of Students With Disabilities will increase their Reading proficiency from 36% to 40% as measured by the ELA FAST.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for data analysis and effective instructional practices for students with disabilities, Collaborative Problem Solving Teams (CPST), and Response to Intervention (RtI).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gia Roberts (gia.roberts@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based strategy will be quarterly, data-driven student/teacher data chats and teacher/administrator data chats along with Collaborative Professional Learning Communities (PLC).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Following each Progress Monitoring (PM) assessment, the PLCs will meet to review data and create next steps based on student needs. Teachers will also participate in data chats with the administration to formulate a plan to meet the needs of multiple subgroups of students, specifically our students with disabilities. Teachers will participate in data chats with students after each PM to assist students with monitoring their progress and setting 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.

1. Engage teachers in Bi-weekly in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for curriculum collaboration and data-driven curriculum planning.
2. Administrators will gather data and meet quarterly for data chats based on Progress Monitoring data.
3. Administrators will meet with teachers quarterly for data chats based on Progress Monitoring data.
4. Instruction will be adjusted to meet the needs of students.

5. ESE Specialist and designated members will meet quarterly regarding ESE student growth on Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Person Responsible: Gia Roberts (gia.roberts@browardschools.com)

By When: Quarterly thru June 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on our 2022-2023 ELA FAST results, our school's achievement is 36% proficiency. Our school has consistently earned 36% proficiency in the ELA component for the past three years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, for school-wide literacy success, the percentage of students scoring proficient will increase from 36% to 39% as measured by the ELA FAST.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for data analysis and effective instructional practices, Collaborative Problem Solving Teams (CPST), Response to Intervention (RtI), and data chats (student/teacher and teacher/administrator).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gia Roberts (gia.roberts@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based strategy will be quarterly, data-driven student/teacher data chats and teacher/administrator data chats along with Collaborative Professional Learning Communities (PLC).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Following each Progress Monitoring (PM) assessment, the PLCs will meet to review data and create next steps based on student needs. Teachers will also participate in data chats with the administration to formulate a plan to meet the needs of multiple subgroups of students, specifically our students with disabilities. Teachers will participate in data chats with students after each PM to assist students with monitoring their progress and setting 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.

1. Implement a school-wide literacy focus with professional development.
2. Engage teachers in weekly in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for curriculum collaboration and data-driven curriculum planning.

3. Administrators will conduct quarterly for data chats with teachers based on Progress Monitoring data.
4. Teachers will conduct quarterly for data chats with students based on Progress Monitoring data.
5. Instruction will be adjusted for students based on data and students' needs.

Person Responsible: Gia Roberts (gia.roberts@browardschools.com)

By When: Quarterly thru June 2024

#3. 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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, more than 900 students in grades 9-12 had regular school attendance below 90%. This area is a critical area of focus as school attendance is directly tied to student academic performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024 the number of students with attendance below 90% will be reduced by at least 20% from 900 to at least 720.

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance will be monitored using students meeting Early Warning Systems (EWS) indicators, mental health referrals, Response to Intervention (RtI) referrals, along with monitoring of attendance patterns and trends to provide students targeted support as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alin Andre (alin.andre@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.)

Data will be gathered from early warning attendance indicators available through BASIS. Students who meet these criteria will be discussed through CPST and RtI.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our goal is to reduce the number of students who have attendance below 90% by identifying students through our early warning system and implementing strategies and processes to support those students and reduce the number of students who have attendance below 90%. These strategies are rooted in our school-wide PBIS program, CPST, and RtI.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. The school-wide attendance will be monitored weekly by each grade-level guidance counselor.
2. Counselors will reach out to the parents of students who have three or more consecutive full-day unexcused absences.
3. Students who exhibit a pattern of 5 or more consecutive full-day unexcused absences will be brought up for the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) and Response to Intervention (RtI).

4. The Team Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) will create an intervention plan and support for the students and family.

Person Responsible: Alin Andre (alin.andre@browardschools.com)

By When: Twice a month thru June 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The review of the school improvement funding allocation occurs during the SAC meeting and is reviewed annually to ensure resources are allocated based on needs by this governing body of stakeholders which includes, parents, students, community members, and school leaders.