
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
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

Indian Ridge Middle School

1355 S NOB HILL RD, Davie, FL 33324

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We the staff of Indian Ridge Middle School are committed to the premise that educators, as agents of change in conjunction with the parents, business, and its community members will collaborate to foster the well bring of our students and develop highly technologically informed, self directed, life-long learners each with unique talents who actively participate in their own educational process.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We the staff of Indian Ridge Middle School are committed to the premise that educators, as agents of change in conjunction with the parents, business, and its community members will collaborate to foster the well bring of our students and develop highly technologically informed, self directed, life-long learners each with unique talents who actively participate in their own educational process.

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
Vincent , Natalie	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair, SAC Co-Chair, Develops, plans, and implements curriculum, lesson plans, and educational programs for student audiences within areas of expertise. Advises, tests, and teaches students audiences in a variety of academic subjects. Presents and reinforces learning concepts within a specified subject or subject area.
Birke, Karen	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - deals with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. Ms. Birke coordinates with principal to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.
Cabrera, Adrienne	School Counselor	School counselor - design and deliver school counseling programs that improve student outcomes. They lead, advocate and collaborate to promote equity and access for all students by connecting their school counseling program to the school's academic mission and school improvement plan.
Cohen, Melanie	School Counselor	School counselor - design and deliver school counseling programs that improve student outcomes. They lead, advocate and collaborate to promote equity and access for all students by connecting their school counseling program to the school's academic mission and school improvement plan.
Escobar, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair, Develops, plans, and implements curriculum, lesson plans, and educational programs for student audiences within areas of expertise. Advises, tests, and teaches students audiences in a variety of academic subjects. Presents and reinforces learning concepts within a specified subject or subject area.
Finer, Hailey	School Counselor	School counselor - design and deliver school counseling programs that improve student outcomes. They lead, advocate and collaborate to promote equity and access for all students by connecting their school counseling program to the school's academic mission and school improvement plan.
Murray, Ian	Principal	Provides strategic direction in the school system. Develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff, and oversee facilities.

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.

We involve stakeholders by having monthly SAC meetings, where we discuss SIP development and SIP updates. We have leadership meetings, monthly where we discuss SIP development and SIP updates. Parents who don't attend the SAC meetings can access our SIP via the school website. We use data analysis to create our SIP goals.

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))

Our SIP is monitored regularly during SAC meetings. We review data during the SAC, leadership, department head, and PLC meeting. The plan will be revised based on the data addressed during those meetings.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	200	177	474
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	67	75	211
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	22	61
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	24	51	97
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	209	226	598
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	125	127	338
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	30	40	70

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	104	177	181	462

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	7	5	5	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	6	20

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	99	141	142	382
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	66	73	183
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	17	57
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	8	37	67
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	155	124	397
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	149	110	415
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	46	32	131

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	128	162	132	422	

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	4	4	3	11	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	9	

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	99	141	142	382	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	66	73	183	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	17	57	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	8	37	67	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	155	124	397	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	149	110	415	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	46	32	131	

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	128	162	132	422	

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	4	4	3	11	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	9	

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*	51	53	49	62	54	50	62		
ELA Learning Gains				55			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			31		
Math Achievement*	63	56	56	63	41	36	57		
Math Learning Gains				71			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			22		
Science Achievement*	48	50	49	54	52	53	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	67	68	75	63	58	70		
Middle School Acceleration	66	70	73	74	51	49	52		
Graduation Rate					49	49			
College and Career Acceleration					70	70			
ELP Progress	38	42	40	61	74	76	51		

** 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	57
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	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	612
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	52			
HSP	51			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	48			

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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	55			
HSP	58			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	53			

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	51			63			48	74	66			38
SWD	25			31			20	43	39		6	15
ELL	27			41			21	65	39		6	38
AMI												
ASN	61			76			69	88	73		5	
BLK	47			50			29	65	68		5	
HSP	46			56			37	70	58		6	36
MUL	53			56			46	91	60		5	
PAC												
WHT	58			72			62	79	71		5	
FRL	42			51			35	68	52		6	38

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	62	55	40	63	71	57	54	75	74			61
SWD	28	42	35	27	53	42	26	43	41			
ELL	40	50	45	45	65	55	30	56	55			61
AMI												
ASN	69	55	47	76	90	90	56	83	84			
BLK	54	55	41	52	64	51	34	75	68			
HSP	57	54	41	57	68	58	50	71	69			57
MUL	65	61		58	68		56	83				
PAC												
WHT	69	57	37	72	75	53	61	78	78			
FRL	53	51	42	53	66	54	45	68	62			39

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	62	52	31	57	33	22	52	70	52			51
SWD	25	28	23	24	24	19	13	39	41			
ELL	44	45	29	43	32	27	28	58	54			51
AMI												
ASN	78	72	53	79	50		77	75	72			
BLK	58	49	29	46	33	27	45	72	44			
HSP	55	48	32	48	29	21	39	66	44			49
MUL	67	63		57	38		60		64			
PAC												
WHT	68	54	29	65	35	21	65	75	57			
FRL	52	46	30	45	29	21	38	63	43			53

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	49%	-2%	47%	0%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	47%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	64%	54%	10%	54%	10%
07	2023 - Spring	63%	51%	12%	48%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	46%	3%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	38%	-5%	44%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	48%	48%	50%	46%

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

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	63%	36%	63%	36%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	64%	8%	66%	6%

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 discussed will reflect the 2023-24 academic school year. The data component that showed the lowest performance for Indian Ridge is ELA lowest 25th percentile. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance are lack of shared practices across disciplines, collaborations between PLCs, and variations/ differentiation in teaching practices over the years. As a result of instructional practices not adapting to meet the needs of these diverse learners; our ELA lowest 25th percentile has slowly declined over the last 3 years.

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

The data discussed will reflect the 2023-24 academic school year. ELA learning gains was the data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year. The factors that contributed to this decline are lack of shared practices across disciplines, collaborations between PLCs, and variations/ differentiation in teaching practices over the years.

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 was science. The factors that contributed to this decline are lack of shared practices across disciplines, collaborations between PLCs, and variations/ differentiation in teaching practices over the years. Another factor that contributed to this decline is the lack of cross-curricular reading.

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

The data discussed will reflect the 2023-24 academic school year. The data component that has the greatest improvement was mathematics achievement. The factors that contributed to this achievement are the use of district and state resources in instructional practices, collaboration among colleagues, and shared practices in PLCs.

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

After reviewing data with administration, we have determined that the two potential areas of concern are chronic absenteeism and level 1 on statewide ELA assessment.

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

Lowest 25th percentile in math and ELA, data analysis, PLCs, life skills and wellness (LSW), and cross-curricular reading.

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.

The data discussed will reflect the 2023-24 academic school year. As per our district 3 year trend data, the lowest 25th percentile in ELA has been slowly declining.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, SWDs will be at a rate of or above 41% FPPI. Additionally, by June 2024 the lowest 25th percentile in ELA will increase from 40% to 45% as evidenced by the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Data analysis through PLCs and district assessments and resources.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Birke (karenbirke@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.)

We plan to discuss and drive instruction based on common formative assessment (CFA) results. Remediation and enrichment will take place after the CFA in order to make sure the students understand the skill/ standard. If it is evident that the student shows proficiency on the skill/ standard they will receive more challenging practice (enrichment).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data analysis is the most effective measurable tool for instruction, remediation, and enrichment. The level of evidence is the lowest 25th percentile, which was determined by the ELA FAST assessment. As per our district 3-year trend data, the lowest 25th percentile in ELA has been slowly declining. We chose an enrichment intervention to provide environments that are stimulating and address cognitive, physical and emotional needs for our gifted children. We chose remediation for children who require further educational support to become competent at their necessary subject.

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.

After-school extra learning opportunities will be offered to students for ELA content.

Person Responsible: Carla Grasso (carla.grasso@browardschools.com)

By When: April 4, 2024

#2. 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.

Based on the data received from the cognia e-prove surveys, we determined that creating a positive culture and environment was a crucial need. This will improve teacher, students and stakeholder relationships as well as have a positive impact on student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the current academic school year, our school will increase the overall sense of belonging and positive engagement among students and staff, as measured by a student satisfaction survey by 80% of the students completing the survey.

Monitoring:

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

This area focus will be monitored by administering student satisfaction surveys periodically throughout the academic year to gauge changes in students' sense of belonging and engagement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Birke (karenbirke@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.)

As part of the Positive Behavior Interventions and Support Systems (PBIS), we use R.O.A.R. (Respect, Ownership, Attitude, and Responsibility). Staff gives tickets to students who are caught demonstrating good/positive behavior. the purpose of

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose of this program is to establish a schoolwide culture of recognizing and rewarding good behavior. Encouraging students to adopt a mindset of doing what is right. When other students notice their peers being rewarded for good behavior this will hopefully motivate them to do the same.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers participating and giving out R.O.A.R. tickets.

Person Responsible: Karen Birke (karenbirke@browardschools.com)

By When: At the start of the school year and continuously throughout .

#3. 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.

The data discussed will reflect the 2023-24 academic school year. As per our district 3-year trend data, the scores in ELA have been slowly declining.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of students scoring proficient or higher in ELA will increase from 49% to 52% by the end of June 2024 as measured by the ELA FAST test.

Monitoring:

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

Data analysis through PLCs, district assessments, and resources.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Birke (karenbirke@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.)

We plan to discuss and drive instruction based on common formative assessment (CFA) results. Remediation and enrichment will take place after the CFA in order to make sure the students understand the skill/ standard. If it is evident that the student shows proficiency on the skill/ standard they will receive more challenging practice (enrichment).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data analysis is the most effective measurable tool for instruction, remediation, and enrichment. The level of evidence are the ELA school scores, which was determined by the ELA FAST assessment.

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.

After-school extra learning opportunities will be offered to students for ELA content.

Person Responsible: Carla Grasso (carla.grasso@browardschools.com)

By When: April 4, 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).

We have set aside funds from our school accountability funds (SAF) from SAC for our most fragile subgroup. These funds will be used to provide after school tutoring/ homework help, and Saturday school. Additionally, we provide our students in this subgroup with a learning strategies class, which assists with preparing, organizing and providing additional academic support. We also provide these students with push in and pull-out services.

If funds are requested after to the agenda is made the SAC coordinators will put it down as new business. The proposal will be discussed and voted upon with a roll call vote.