

Broward County Public Schools

# Boyd H. Anderson High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Boyd H. Anderson High School

3050 NW 41ST ST, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33309

[ 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.**

Boyd H. Anderson High School understands that in order to succeed in the 21st century, graduates need to have as many tools at their disposal as possible. With this in mind, the school's mission, through open-minded inquiry-based learning, we will empower students to be college and career ready to succeed in a global society.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our school's vision is operated using intellectual, structural, and relationship capital. All leaders are committed to employing teaching and learning strategies that encourage forward movement by building relationships in each of the aforementioned capacities. Implementing these strategies allows the staff to provide individualized schedules created to serve students' academic needs. Programs such as Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), International Baccalaureate (IB), Health and Wellness, Exceptional Student Education (ESE), and Entrepreneurship Leadership Military Academy (ELMA) ensure students have the choice to pursue advanced academic programs which would allow them to be prepared for college level courses and career pathways.

In some cases, students will graduate with college credit and will enter higher education better equipped than the average freshman. If they so desire, students can also take elective classes such as culinary, dance, music world, gaming and simulation, and aerospace technology in which they will be able to become certified in that particular skill since the 2016-2017 school year. The Health and Wellness program offers certification in Nursing Assistant, and Emergency Medical Rescue (EMR) . These students will be well prepared to enter the work force and begin their careers upon graduation based on their passing of industry certification exams. The specific classes that are offered were chosen based on targeting multiple areas of interest for students. The school is staffed with teachers who are certified within their areas of expertise. Each teacher works collaboratively with the school to provide instruction that is geared towards the individual student through differentiation.

### 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
Griffin, James	Principal	Oversees implementation of School Improvement Plan
Duperval, Marie	Assistant Principal	Oversees social studies teachers and English Language Learner students who work with students on literacy skills: ensures students receive the services they need.
Fairclough, Nandrané	Assistant Principal	Oversees ELA Reading K-12 Comprehensive Plan implementation
Ries, Andra	Assistant Principal	Oversees Math and Science curriculum and support and dual enrollment to ensure full implementation of the SIP.
Killinger, Meagan	Instructional Coach	Provides coaching, modeling, support and ensures implementation of the K-12 CERP is followed schoolwide and the SIP is continuously monitored for improvement.

### 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.

Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups are invited to provide feedback and voice their concerns and collaborate in problem solving. We also invite them to be apart of SAC to help allocate and vote budgetary items conducive to student achievement and the school improvement 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))

Monitoring SIP requires a systematic approach. The steps we take to monitor are as follows: setting clear goals and objectives, identifying key performance indicators, data collection, using a tracking system, regular reviews to revise the plan for continuous improvement. We also identify strengths and areas for improvement and make adjustments as needed and remain as flexible as possible. As a leadership team we share results with all stakeholders to ensure accountability. Our leadership team provides training and support where areas of improvements are identified and provide the necessary resources, training, and support to our staff.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	98%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## 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*	30	50	50	23	52	51	15		
ELA Learning Gains				42			29		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			40		
Math Achievement*	23	36	38	18	41	38	10		



Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				47			18		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			43		
Science Achievement*	40	60	64	17	35	40	23		
Social Studies Achievement*	28	66	66	26	51	48	32		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	84	90	89	93	54	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	50	61	65	56	66	67	56		
ELP Progress	38	50	45	51			43		

*\* 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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	293
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	84

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	470
Total Components for the Federal Index	11

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	93

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

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	25	Yes	4	1
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	40	Yes	2	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	40	Yes	1	

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	36	Yes	1	
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)

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	30			23			40	28		84	50	38
SWD	12			8			15	10		27	6	
ELL	15			20			27	13		57	7	38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			23			40	28		50	7	35
HSP	36			25			35	19		50	7	46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	28			24			36	26		51	7	34

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	23	42	41	18	47	56	17	26		93	56	51
SWD	13	28	22	14	49	55	18	25		88	34	
ELL	14	43	43	30	57	61	14	18		95	60	51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	42	41	18	48	57	16	27		94	55	53
HSP	28	35	26	14	30		23	17		85	71	42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	36											
FRL	23	41	43	15	45	56	14	28		93	55	60

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	15	29	40	10	18	43	23	32		96	56	43
SWD	17	26	31	19	28	43	8	17		98	28	
ELL	8	32	43	9	21	42	19	20		95	67	43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	15	28	39	9	17	41	21	32		97	55	46
HSP	17	35	44	19	30		43	38		89	71	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	16	28	38	10	18	43	23	30		96	56	47

### 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	32%	49%	-17%	50%	-18%
09	2023 - Spring	28%	49%	-21%	48%	-20%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	26%	48%	-22%	50%	-24%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	46%	-27%	48%	-29%

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

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

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	27%	62%	-35%	63%	-36%

### 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 with the lowest performance was the Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) exam. Only 19% of Geometry students performed on grade level at a level 3 or higher. The primary contributing factor was instructional strategy implementation. There were 3 geometry teachers. We had an interim substitute teacher for the entire year due to one of our teachers being out on Military Leave. Additionally, one of the other teachers was new and needed ongoing support. The level of instruction and progress monitoring was not as strong as it should have been. The geometry actually increased from the prior year by 6 points, but was 28 points below the District average of 47%. This year there are support classes for geometry students, experienced teachers, and a more solid instructional plan with progress monitoring.

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

Although none of our data components showed a decline, it is important to highlight the stagnant growth in US History showed only 2% growth from 2022 to 2023 with 25% of students performing at a level 3 or above in 2022 and 27% in 2023. The past 3 years have had a different set of US History teachers. In the beginning of the last year, two of the three teachers left in the beginning month of school requiring us to hire a sub and a first year teacher. Later in the year, the third teacher of the team resigned a week before testing. Having a shared resource and utilizing smart goals to accommodate the new teachers and still make some growth we utilized small groups to focus on primary documents and political cartoons aligned with test item specs.

**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.**

US History scores had the greatest gap when compared to the State Average. The District and State average were at 63% , where only 27% of our students scored level 3 or higher. Again, the past 3 years have had a different set of US History teachers. In the beginning of the last year, two of the three teachers left in the beginning month of school requiring us to hire a sub and a first year teacher. Later in the year, the third teacher of the team resigned a week before testing. Having a shared resource and utilizing smart goals to accommodate the new teachers and still make some growth we utilized small groups to focus on primary documents and political cartoons aligned with test item specs.

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

Most of our data showed significant growth. ELA (9th and 10th combined) increased from 23% to 31%, Math (Algebra and geometry combined) increased from 18% to 24%, and the greatest growth was in Biology, from 18% to 39% scoring level 3 or higher. The biology team took a more proactive approach. Biology teachers and coach met twice weekly during common planning to monitor student progress and address gaps in learning through small group rotation schedule. Additionally, students were pulled out of study hall to address weak standards and provide additional instruction based on 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.**

For the upcoming school year our top priorities for school improvement are strengthening math instruction, providing an in depth US History instructional review to increase proficiency, expand and replicate the biology model to continue increasing in science proficiency, support for new and interim teachers to broaden data driven instructional approaches to continue to close the achievement gap in ELA proficiency, and increase acceleration.

**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 Other****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.

Historically, Boyd Anderson has not exceeded 24% proficiency in ELA. This past school year we were able to increase our proficiency to 30%. In order for continuous improvement to happen we must provide an inclusive environment for all students to feel safe and secure while learning. Implementing incentives and ongoing support is critical to closing the achievement gap.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By June 2024, all subgroups (especially SWD at 35%, Hispanic at 37%, White at 36%) will achieve the target of 41% or higher per the Federal Percent of Points Index for performance on the end of year statewide ELA assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will monitor CFA data bi-weekly as well as state and district assessment data to ensure that our strategies are successful.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Nandrane Fairclough (nandrane.fairclough@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.)

Tier 1-3 supports will be implemented according to data. The ESE facilitator will ensure that teachers are receiving professional development on support and accommodations. Teachers will implement data-based differentiated instruction.

Differentiated instruction is implemented through stations. Groups are formed using student performance data. Since one of our target subgroups is SWD it is essential that students received specific accommodations as documented in their Individual Education Plan.

Certified classrooms with stations rotations are implemented in every classroom. Stations include: technology, collaboration, and one on one teacher stations. Stations provide differentiated instruction for each student with a personalized pathway to aid students in mastery of standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy was selected to ensure each student receives one to one instruction with the teacher. Teachers will use the adopted text Into-Literature with various components. The students who are Level 1 are also assigned to Read 180 or System 44 with continuous progressing monitoring. Tiered instruction is implemented throughout the curriculum based on data. Across the curriculum this strategy is being implemented. Students will see consistently across all classrooms and hear common language.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Students performing below grade level will be identified and provided teacher designed stations for individualized learning pathways to close gaps in their learning.
2. Teachers will design stations with the assistance of the Literacy Coach and Instructional Support person based on data.

**Person Responsible:** Meagan Killinger (meaganlouise.killinger@browardschools.com)

**By When:** 8/21/2023 and thru the 1st quarter as needed

3. Teachers will conduct data chats with students and contact parents to keep them updated.
4. Teachers will triangulate data from CFAs and diagnostic assessments to make informed instructional decisions to keep groupings effective.
5. Instructional leaders will meet to with teachers weekly to conduct building capacity meetings to remove barriers for teachers so they can focus on teaching and learning.
6. Modeling, co-teaching, and timely feedback will be given to teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Meagan Killinger (meaganlouise.killinger@browardschools.com)

**By When:** Ongoing support thru June 2024



## #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

### 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.

Our target for all of our ESSA subgroups is at least 41% per the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI). This is a crucial focus of need, because of our lowest performing subgroups below the 41% FPPI: SWD subgroup is 35%, White subgroup is 36% and Hispanic subgroup is 37%. Out of the three lowest performing, the Hispanic student population is continuously increasing. The students are placed in a developmental language classroom and they need more support than the resources provide. The leadership team has provided the students with a support person and extended learning opportunities to aid in mastery of the English language and B.E.S.T. standards.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, all subgroups, with a targeted focus on our SWD, Hispanic and White subgroups, will achieve the target of 41% or higher per the Federal Percent of Points Index for performance on the end of year statewide assessments.

This goal is data-driven and objective. Also, it aligns with the Federal Performance Standards. This aim takes into account the current educational prowess of the students and the desired rate of improvement. Assessment of the students' progress will be done continually throughout the academic year, using various formative and summative assessments, to ensure that the teaching methods deployed are effective towards achieving this goal. By the end of the academic year, the school intends to meet or exceed this performance target as evidence of improved student proficiency and academic success.

### Monitoring:

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

We will monitor CFA data and disaggregate it by subgroup as well as state and district assessment data to make sure our strategies are successful and adjust as necessary for the desired outcome.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Meagan Killinger (meaganlouise.killinger@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.)

Tier 1-3 supports will be implemented according to data. The ESE facilitator will ensure that teachers are receiving professional development on support and accommodations. Teachers will implement data-based differentiated instruction to all students. Differentiated instruction is implemented through stations. Groups will be formed using individual student performance data. Since one of our target subgroups is SWD it is essential that students received specific accommodations as documented in their Individual Education Plan.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated instruction through learning stations is chosen for several compelling reasons:

1. Tailored Learning: Differentiated instruction recognizes that students have varied learning styles and different levels of understanding. It is about adjusting the teaching process to match student's individual knowledge, skills, and aptitude, thus ensuring that all learners can grasp the material at their own pace and in their preferred style. This approach tends to yield more positive results compared to traditional,

one-size-fits-all teaching methods.

2. **Interactive Learning:** Learning stations provide a more interactive and engaging learning environment. Students not only learn from the teacher but also from their peers. This promotes collaboration and communication skills.

3. **Consistent Engagement:** By rotating through stations, students continually engage with new activities. This helps to hold their attention and can reduce issues with disinterest or distraction. Such consistency in engagement improves knowledge retention.

4. **Reinforcing and Enriching Content:** Learning stations can reinforce content learned in lectures or introduce more advanced concepts. This allows for content to be reviewed and deepened. Stations can also provide opportunities for extension activities, catering for advanced students who may need additional challenges.

5. **Frees up teacher time:** While students are busy working at their respective stations, the teacher can provide more focused, personalized attention to individuals or small groups. This can be particularly beneficial for students who are struggling or excelling.

6. **Increases Student Autonomy:** Students often have more freedom to explore their interests and take ownership of their learning within learning stations. This can serve to increase intrinsic motivation.

Given these reasons, differentiated instruction through learning stations offers a robust and multifaceted framework for effective learning in diverse classrooms and it will assist us in achieving our goal of 41% or higher Federal Percent of Points Index.

#### **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 instructional leadership team will design professional development for staff that addresses cultural awareness and ELL strategies to close the achievement gap.
2. We will host Parent University monthly to assist parents with curriculum questions and provide information to assist their students with being successful.
3. We will administer beginning, middle and end of year assessments to monitor progress.
4. Interim assessments will be administered for flexible grouping, enrichment, and remediation.

**Person Responsible:** Meagan Killinger (meaganlouise.killinger@browardschools.com)

**By When:** By May 2024, we will have implemented all strategies and plans to ensure we meet our goal of 41% or higher with our ESSA subgroups (especially our SWD, White, and Hispanic).

## **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)).

**Process to Review School Improvement Funding Allocations and Ensuring Resource Allocation Based on Needs:**

**Initial Assessment and Stakeholder Engagement:** We began with a comprehensive assessment of current resources and needs by referencing the School Improvement Plan (SIP) developed and updated annually. This involves input from the school leaders, support staff, and other stakeholders, as evidenced in our recent communications about the SIP.

**Expertise-driven Allocations:** As the SIP reveals, leaders are assigned elements that align with their areas of expertise. This intentional alignment allows for a more precise allocation of funds because these individuals can best identify the specific needs and costs associated with their areas of the plan.

**Review of Previous Year's Initiatives:** Before new allocations are made, we evaluate the success and outcomes of the previous year's initiatives. School leaders and support staff are encouraged to revisit the sections they worked on, ensuring that funds are used efficiently and that successful strategies are continued or expanded.

**Collaborative Decision-making:** Collaboration remains at the heart of our resource allocation strategy. As specific SIP elements are resonant with certain areas of expertise, it's essential to pull in members with specific knowledge when deciding how to distribute funds. This approach ensures that every penny is directed where it will have the most significant impact, meeting the unique needs of our school and student body.

**SMARTIE Goal Framework:** All funding decisions are anchored in the SMARTIE goals framework. These goals provide a clear roadmap for where resources should be allocated to achieve specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound, inclusive, and equitable outcomes.

**Continuous Feedback Loop:** Once funds are allocated and initiatives are in motion, there's a need for ongoing assessment. The process is iterative. Feedback from all stakeholders, including students, families, staff, and community members, is collected and incorporated into future resource allocation decisions.

**Regulatory Compliance:** We ensure that all funding decisions comply with the stipulations laid out in the ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) for schools identified as ATSI, TSI, or CSI. This includes both the allocation of resources and the documentation of how those decisions were made.

By following this robust and inclusive process, we ensure that our school improvement funds are allocated most effectively, meeting the pressing needs of our institution and ensuring the best possible outcomes for our students.