

Broward County Public Schools

Monarch High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Monarch High School

5050 WILES RD, Coconut Creek, FL 33073

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of our school is the same as the district. Educating all students to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of our school is the same as the district. Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cecil, James	Principal	School Principal oversees the all operational and academic programs
Lang, Kay	Assistant Principal	10th grade Administrator; Oversees Math, Science and SIP
May, Kenneth	Assistant Principal	12th grade administrator; Oversees ELLs
Sweeting-Miller, Moira	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for 11th grade; Oversees ESE and Reading
Hawkins, Shelley	Reading Coach	Oversees Schoolwide Reading and Professional Development

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.

Community and stakeholder involvement is a integral part of the development of the Monarch High School Improvement Plan. The process of recruiting and soliciting stakeholder involvement is ongoing. Our school community receives information during parent meetings, from our website, parent links and surveys. Through our partnerships we are able to gather input from our local business establishments. School staff are represented and provide input on the development of the School Improvement Plan through the review of classroom instructional data and standardized testing data.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP Plan will be monitored quarterly for effective implementation. Interim data collected will be utilized to monitor student achievement on the State academic standards. Our leadership team will monitor the performance of our students who struggle with achieving proficiency and make recommendations to remediate the gaps. These recommendations will be presented to the SAC and will allocate funds to provide materials, extended learning opportunities and or staff development recommendations for various staff if necessary.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50	50	50	51	52	51	51		
ELA Learning Gains				53			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			44		
Math Achievement*	28	36	38	31	41	38	26		
Math Learning Gains				52			13		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			14		
Science Achievement*	68	60	64	51	35	40	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	66	66	61	51	48	46		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	92	90	89	94	54	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	56	61	65	60	66	67	60		
ELP Progress	40	50	45	44			48		

** 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	391
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	592
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	94

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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	50			
HSP	54			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	51			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	50			
HSP	54			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	52			

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	50			28			68	57		92	56	40
SWD	22			11			31	31		21	6	
ELL	33			23			56	43		54	7	40
AMI												
ASN	73			71			82	93		69	6	
BLK	37			17			58	44		53	6	
HSP	49			29			65	53		55	7	36
MUL	64			42			82	61		38	6	
PAC												
WHT	58			35			77	68		60	6	
FRL	43			24			61	52		55	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	51	53	42	31	52	53	51	61		94	60	44
SWD	20	40	33	18	38	40	29	44		98	27	
ELL	29	52	42	20	54	46	30	37		92	47	44
AMI												
ASN	73	68		52	53		83	69		96	79	
BLK	38	49	39	24	54	60	41	59		92	45	
HSP	49	53	49	29	51	52	46	66		93	54	47
MUL	60	58		44	50		58	86		87	69	
PAC												
WHT	58	53	35	39	50	41	64	66		97	70	
FRL	44	53	47	27	50	52	45	63		92	53	41

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	51	47	44	26	13	14	50	46		97	60	48
SWD	22	38	31	16	12	20				97	42	
ELL	29	45	48	21	14	16	20			94	44	48
AMI												
ASN	64	48		44	21					100	85	
BLK	40	45	46	20	15	17				98	52	
HSP	46	45	42	26	14	20	52			96	54	50
MUL	50	38		14	8					100	56	
PAC												
WHT	62	51	45	30	11	8	50	64		98	68	
FRL	43	46	45	24	10	12	38	50		96	56	58

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	50%	49%	1%	50%	0%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	48%	1%

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	36%	46%	-10%	48%	-12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	63%	2%	63%	2%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	63%	-8%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is Math achievement level at 31%. Contributing factors included the implementation of new State Standards and adoption of a new State Approved text. Teacher professional development activities involved doing cross walks trying to learn how the new standards were different from the previous standards. Instructional materials and assessments were modified to ensure alignment. The SAVVAS textbook resource was challenging. The on-line resources- tests, quizzes were sometimes difficult to utilize as they were not secure(students could access outside of the class). Readiness Tests were administered and data analyzed. Student

diagnostic data revealed that students struggle with foundational skills necessary for success in high school math. Our school was informed that the incoming students from our local feeder middle school had substitute teachers for approximately half the school year due to staff resignations or leaves. Student overall school attendance was a challenge during the school year, with over 50% of our students missing 10% or more days. This impacted their grades and performance on the EOC state assessments.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the performance of our students in the area of Social Studies. During the 2021 school year the proficiency level was 66%. During the 2022 school year the number of students proficient on the Social Studies EOC was 55% a decline of 11%. Student achievement levels were impacted by our student body overall attendance (over 50% of students missed 10% or more days). Students in the lowest 25% in the English Language Arts declined in performance from 2021 (42%) when compared to their performance in 2021 (44%). ELA student achievement levels were 51% in 2021, 2022, 2023. While the data did not exhibit a decline there was no growth in the number of students who scored proficient on the ELA state assessment.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is in the area of Math Proficiency. A review of data trends from the 2022 school year revealed that at the school level, 48% of students in Math were at Level 1 proficiency compared to 30% for the district and 28% for the state. Our analysis of the school wide data for Math proficiency among students with disabilities was 11% in comparison with the state which was 25%. Statewide the proficiency level of students without disabilities was 55% and school-wide was 32%. A gap of 23%. We believe that a contributing factor was that the students missed foundational knowledge during the pandemic and student non-attendance.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the area of Biology Proficiency. Monarch High School improved from 52% proficiency to a 62% proficiency a growth of 13 percentage points. We ranked # 10 out of 30 other high schools. Actions taken to improve in this area included extensive professional development on the test item specifications. During our weekly PLC meetings teachers reviewed the students' assessment data and determined what concepts needed to be reviewed. Students also had extended learning opportunities after school to review areas of weakness. Students also completed a Biology Practice Test that simulated the types of questions students would encounter on the EOC.

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.

Our top priorities for school improvement during the school year will be to improve the number of students who are proficient in the Algebra 1. Our overall score is below the state average. 25 % of our students scored at a level 3, 4 or 5 on the Algebra EOC assessment. In addition, the performance levels of our students with disabilities was a concern with 38% of students achieving learning gains on the 2022 state assessment. The learning gains for students school wide was 51%. In the area of ELA, Monarch High scored 51% proficiency school wide in 2022, During school year 2021 the overall proficiency level

was 51% a decrease of 3% from school year 2019 when the proficiency levels were at 54% school wide. ELA proficiency for students with disabilities dropped from a high of 27% during the 2019 school year to 20% during the 2022 school year. We plan to provide professional development in the area of student engagement, vocabulary strategies, and student centers. The Science of Reading training will be presented to assist in the inclusion of reading strategies in the content area. We have implemented the Gradual Release Model to assist in the utilization of the block and to increase student engagement through interactive classroom lessons. Monarch High has also implemented a school wide vocabulary study strategy to assist students as they tackle difficult to understand content area books. A focus on vocabulary instruction will also improve students background knowledge and the ability to speak and write using academic language.

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.

One area of focus is creating a positive culture and environment. We have created a program to improve students social and emotional wellness by making the theme of being KIND a school wide initiative. "Be the One to be K.I.N.D. (Knights Insists on Nice Deeds) is our theme that has been shared school wide with our staff, students and parents. Posters were created for classrooms and offices. Banners were posted school wide. Students are challenged to be kind in their classrooms, hallways, cafeteria, on the bus. In reviewing, both formal and informal data we determined that our SWD struggled with overall school engagement. Having a schoolwide focus of kindness could increase their overall well being leading to increased academic performance

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 number of reported altercations, will decrease by 30% as measured by school wide discipline data. During the school year 2023 there were a total of 23 reported altercations on our school campus.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored quarterly. Current data will be compared with data from the same time period last school year through the Discipline Management System regarding the number of altercations, bullying and classroom defiance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidenced based intervention being implemented for this area of focus to improve students social emotional wellness by implementing a school wide focus on being kind to others.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research from the U.S department of Eudcations shows that students overall social emotional wellbeing impacts their ability to engage fully in the educational programming in school. If students feel supported and accepted in school their overall level of performance will improve.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Data disaggregated from Discipline Management System regarding the number of altercations, bullying and classroom defiance.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: Ongoing thru June 2024

Implement the schoolwide Recognition program designed to reward students and staff that exemplify being Kind.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: By September 2023 - Ongoing thru June 2024 for recognition

Advertise to the school community (Open house, Advisory Meeting PTSA, website, school announcements).

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: Ongoing thru June 2024

#2. 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.

An area of focus is the academic achievement of students with disabilities. Monarch has not shown progress for 2 consecutive years in the Federal Percent of Points Index (School score was 39%. Minimum needed is 41%) During the 2022 school year SWD achievement level was 18% in the area of Mathematics compared to 31% schoolwide.

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 SWD subgroup will score 41 percent or above on the Federal Index per the 2023 statewide end of year assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by the use of the Broward Schools Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kay Lang (kay.lang@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.)

Students will receive instruction using the state adopted text SAVVAS, SuccessMaker, and IXEL. Teachers will utilize the gradual release of responsibility model to deliver instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The gradual release of responsibility model is a research based strategy to assist with the utilization of the teaching block, encourages student collaboration and ensure that students receive multiple opportunities to practice concepts.

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.

Disaggregate demographic student achievement data.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: By August 2023

Provide professional learning for instructional staff for gradual release of responsibility, instructional technology and vocabulary strategies.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: On going to June 2024

Conduct data chats following diagnostic/readiness test and progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: On going to June 2024

Provide extended learning opportunities for students.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: On going to June of 2024

#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.

In the area of English Language Arts student achievement for the 2022 school year was 51% school wide. The scores remained the same from the previous year. This is a crucial area, because we must ensure that our students are college and career ready.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 55% of students will be proficient as measured by the ELA FAST Progress Monitoring 3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Students' progress will be monitored using data from Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 assessments. This data will be utilized during data chats and provide remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shelley Hawkins (shelley.l.hawkins@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.)

Students will receive instruction using Read-180, Albert-IO, HMH selections, NewsELA, Study Island

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The materials and instructional strategies are State Approved and research based.

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.

Disaggregate student ELA data to determine student achievement level.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: By August 2023

Provide Professional Learning for the research based strategies gradual release of responsibility, vocabulary strategies and instructional technology.

Person Responsible: Shelley Hawkins (shelley.l.hawkins@browardschools.com)

By When: On going June 2024

Conduct data talks after Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 assessments.

Person Responsible: Shelley Hawkins (shelley.l.hawkins@browardschools.com)

By When: By June 2024

Provide Extended Learning Opportunities for students.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: On going to June 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

In the area of Math achievement Monarch has struggled in the past 3 years. During the 2021 school year 26% of our student were proficient in Math. During school year 2022 and 2023 proficiency levels were 32 %, 31% respectively.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 42% of students enrolled in Math will score at a level 3, 4, or 5 as measured by the End of Course Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by using the results of our district 4 progress monitoring assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kay Lang (kay.lang@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.)

Students will be instructed using the state approved core text SAAVAS. Instruction will be delivered using the gradual release of responsibility model. Supplemental teacher made materials will be utilized for remediation and enrichment activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy is research based and will provide practice opportunities for struggling students. They need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement.

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.

Review the 2022-23 math EOC data to determine needs and support.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: By August 2023

Schedule students into appropriate math courses.

Person Responsible: Moira Sweeting-Miller (moira.sweeting-miller@browardschools.com)

By When: By October 2023

Conduct Data chats with teachers to identify students demographic data and those students who need extra support.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: Ongoing to June 2024

Administer Progress Monitoring Assessment and conduct data review to determine students in need of enrichment or remediation.

Person Responsible: Kay Lang (kay.lang@browardschools.com)

By When: Ongoing to June of 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).

School Improvement Funds are allocated by data review and prioritizing the areas of needs. Recommended resources are viewed by the School Advisory Committee to ensure that we do not replicate any resources and to ensure the efficacy of the resource. The SAC committee reviewed data, proposed programs and voted on the school improvement funding that provides resources for our extended learning opportunities for all student subgroups.