

Broward County Public Schools

# South Plantation 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>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</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>

# South Plantation High School

1300 PALADIN WAY, Plantation, FL 33317

[ 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.**

To inspire and develop all Paladins through positive relationships and meaningful high quality instruction to reach their highest potential.

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

Be Your Best Self, Be "South".

### 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
Henschel, Christine	Principal	To effectively oversee all school operations, including daily school activities. And to coordinate curriculums, manage staff, and provide a safe and productive learning environment for students, faculty, and staff.
Brunache, Sparkle	Assistant Principal	English Department, School Improvement Plan, Clinic, First Responder, Media Center,
Marino, Ricardo	Assistant Principal	CTE, Safety & Security, Social Studies
O'Brien, Cindy	Assistant Principal	Master Scheduler, Cambridge, AP programs
Williams, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach, academic support
Manuell, Ryan	Other	State Compliance with IEP and EP's, Conduct, annual reviews.

**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.

Monthly meetings are held to discuss insights and school data. The School Advisory Council is a huge part of making sure our stakeholders are involved in the process of decision making and developing our school improvement plan. Our SAC includes parents of all diverse populations, staff, business partners,

community members and students, We set goals and develop action plans along with celebrating the achievements of our students and staff.

**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 school improvement plan will be monitored through a multi-faceted approach to ensure its effective implementation and impact on enhancing student achievement in alignment with State academic standards. Regular progress assessments, both formative and summative, will be conducted to evaluate the plan's effectiveness. Data analysis will focus on identifying trends and patterns in student performance, with a specific emphasis on addressing the achievement gap for underserved students. Continuous collaboration among teachers, administrators, and instructional coaches will facilitate the sharing of best practices and timely interventions to support struggling students. Periodic reviews of the plan's objectives and strategies will be conducted, allowing for adjustments based on real-time feedback, thus ensuring sustained progress in closing the achievement gap and promoting equitable educational outcomes.

**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>	80%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	78%
<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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) 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>	

**Early Warning Systems**

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

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

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

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



Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	561
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	386
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	775

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

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

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

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

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**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*	44	50	50	49	52	51	47		
ELA Learning Gains				53			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			38		
Math Achievement*	28	36	38	23	41	38	22		
Math Learning Gains				40			18		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			28		
Science Achievement*	52	60	64	40	35	40	44		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	66	66	64	51	48	56		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	95	90	89	97	54	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	61	61	65	56	66	67	57		
ELP Progress	29	50	45	46			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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	557
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	97

**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	41			
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	47			
HSP	53			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	73			

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	50			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	47			
HSP	49			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	47			

**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	44			28			52	65		95	61	29
SWD	21			20			31	35		39	6	
ELL	19			19			42	33		42	7	29
AMI												
ASN	48			38			60	90		82	6	
BLK	34			23			40	61		44	7	30
HSP	43			27			54	57		65	7	30
MUL	56			27			70	64		63	6	

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	64			45			67	85		77	6	
FRL	39			23			47	59		57	7	33

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	49	53	39	23	40	50	40	64		97	56	46
SWD	21	39	29	16	29	45	26	36		89	25	
ELL	21	37	33	10	44	67	20	26		98	52	46
AMI												
ASN	76	65						91				
BLK	40	51	42	16	37	46	40	61		97	39	
HSP	43	52	37	22	42	55	35	52		98	55	44
MUL	73	70		44	45		64	73		100	67	
PAC												
WHT	69	54	39	38	40	40	48	81		96	87	
FRL	43	50	40	21	37	45	40	58		97	47	42

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	47	46	38	22	18	28	44	56		99	57	43
SWD	17	33	33	14	24	40	24	25		100	27	
ELL	18	35	35	18	28	33	38	40		100	39	43
AMI												
ASN	73	68		36	20			67		100	71	
BLK	36	40	33	20	16	26	40	42		99	52	50
HSP	41	47	44	22	19	26	41	57		99	53	42
MUL	52	35		13	25			60		100	67	
PAC												
WHT	73	55	26	28	20	39	57	76		99	71	
FRL	37	42	39	17	16	26	39	50		99	53	39

**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	42%	49%	-7%	50%	-8%
09	2023 - Spring	44%	49%	-5%	48%	-4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	35%	48%	-13%	50%	-15%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	31%	46%	-15%	48%	-17%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	63%	-13%	63%	-13%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	62%	-1%	63%	-2%

**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.**

According to the 21-22 school data our SWD (Students With Disabilities) was the lowest subgroup data component and showed the lowest performance with only 36% of the students being proficient. Our SWD continues to be supported throughout all subject areas as teachers are working to provide academic support by incorporating accommodations into their daily classroom instruction.

Also in the 21-22 school data Math achievement showed the lowest performance with 23% proficiency. Since then the math department has worked to provide additional support for the most fragile students which increased student achievement to 32% in the 22-23 school year. Although this area continues to be the lowest achieving the continued collaborative work of the teachers, common assessments, and academic supports that have been put in place will keep increasing our math achievement levels.

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

The ELA achievement showed the greatest decline in the 2021-22 school year the ELA achievement was at 49% under the FSA in the 22-23 school year ELA decreased its achievement to 43% under the new FAST assessment. One factor that contributed was the switch from the FSA to FAST test, the students increased their testing from 1 to 3 assessments. Another factor was teacher placement and more support for level 2 and 3 students.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The greatest data gap when compared to the state is Math. In the 22-23 school year we score 35% in Algebra compared to the states average of 54% and in Geometry we were at 30% compared to the state at 49%. The data gap is 19%, the factors that contributed to this large gap was teacher retention and placement, additional support of fragile students, and more collaboration of curriculum and sharing of best practices in the classroom.

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

Math showed the greatest improvement with a 9% overall increase from the 21-22 school year to 22-23 school year. New actions that were implemented were providing additional support for our most fragile students in the form of double dosing, which is math everyday, as well as push-in and pull-out support from our math esser teacher. We also utilized Aleks which is an online support program that prescribes specific math interventions for students to help fill in the foundational gaps. We also had movement amongst our teachers, switching their teaching assignments to best suit the academic needs of the student.

**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. Increasing our reading proficiency levels from 43% in 23' school year to 50%.
2. Increasing our math proficiency levels from 32% 23' school year to 40%.
3. Increasing our overall acceleration from 65% 23' school year to 75%.

**Area of Focus**

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



**#1. 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.

After reviewing the 22-23 data ELA is an area of focus as our proficiency rate of students dropped from 49% to 43%. This was identified as a critical need because the student's reading proficiency is directly related to all of the other subgroups such as Math 32%, Biology 49%, and US History 61%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By June 2024, the overall ELA proficiency will increase 16 points from 32% on PM 1 to 48% on PM 3 as measured by the ELA F.A.S.T.

**Monitoring:**

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

This will be monitored by the end of unit exams, common formative assessments, midterm exams, and HMH progress monitoring. Professional learning communities will also be closely monitored for collaboration and data analysis. Data chats will also be conducted amongst grade to analysis the data and monitor the progress of the goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sparkle Brunache (sparkle.veasybrunache@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.)

Professional development will be provided school wide to model differentiated instruction, technology integration, supplemental small group instruction, scaffolding strategies, and the science of reading across all content areas.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The specific strategy was selected as a goal to ensure that common language strategies and instructional expectations among staff, students, and administration are implemented. State, county, and school data from 2022-23 school year was used to determine the area of focus

**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.

Conduct professional development on the Science of Reading for all content areas .

**Person Responsible:** Stephanie Williams (stephaniewilliams@browardschools.com)

**By When:** Ongoing thru January 2024

Observe classroom instruction and provide progress monitoring assessments.

**Person Responsible:** Sparkle Brunache (sparkle.veasybrunache@browardschools.com)

**By When:** Ongoing thru March 2024

Evaluate quarterly common formative assessments designed to evaluate reading growth from FAST PM1 to PM 2.

**Person Responsible:** Sparkle Brunache (sparkle.veasybrunache@browardschools.com)

**By When:** Ongoing thru January 2024

Conduct collaborative data chats amongst various grade level teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Sparkle Brunache (sparkle.veasybrunache@browardschools.com)

**By When:** Ongoing thru January 2024

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

### 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.

High teacher and staff turn over took place in the 23-24 school year there was a total of 15 employees who left, 10 of which were teachers in various subject areas. Because of the teacher turnover many classes were left without an effective highly qualified teacher in it therefore affecting our reading and math proficiency the most.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2024 the teacher turnover rate will be reduced by 20% compared to the previous year, resulting in a more stable and engaged teaching staff.

### Monitoring:

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

Progress towards this goal will be monitored through regular analysis of teacher turnover rates and comparing them to the previous year's data. Feedback from exit interviews and surveys will provide insights into the effectiveness of implemented retention strategies. Quarterly reviews involving key stakeholders will assess the success of action steps and allow for adjustments to be made as needed to ensure the goal's achievement.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sparkle Brunache (sparkle.veasybrunache@browardschools.com)

### Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Research shows that well-structured onboarding programs like TIER for new teachers improve their sense of belonging, confidence, and job satisfaction. Pairing new teachers with mentors, providing comprehensive training, and introducing them to the school's culture and policies can significantly enhance their retention. And also offering continuous professional development opportunities, such as workshops, conferences, and courses, not only helps teachers improve their skills but also enhances their job satisfaction and commitment to the school.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By conducting exit interviews it was discovered that some teacher felt unsupported and would have liked more time to collaborate with their colleagues for further direction.

### 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.

Conduct Exit Interviews

**Person Responsible:** Christine Henschel (christine.henschel@browardschools.com)

**By When:** May 2024

Enhance Onboarding beyond the TIER program.

**Person Responsible:** Sparkle Brunache (sparkle.veasybrunache@browardschools.com)

**By When:** January 2024

Develop Retention Strategies by collaborating with teachers, administrators, and human resources to create targeted retention strategies addressing identified issues, such as professional development, work-life balance, and support systems.

**Person Responsible:** Cindy O'Brien (cindy.o'brien@browardschools.com)

**By When:** January 2024

Create professional learning communities that support new teachers in the professional development of curriculum, planning, and instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Cindy O'Brien (cindy.o'brien@browardschools.com)

**By When:** October 2023

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The process for reviewing school improvement funding allocations and ensuring equitable resource distribution is methodical and focused on addressing our students' needs. Firstly, we gather data on student performance, demographics, and specific challenges faced by different groups. Secondly, this data is analyzed to identify areas requiring improvement and resource allocation. Thirdly any funding allocation request will be presented to the School Advisory Council in the form of a written proposal to include the targeted area of focus as it relates to the school improvement plan, the student benefit for the program, the targeted interventions that are going to be used, the data to support the need, and the dollar amount needed to effectively run the program or resource needed.