

Broward County Public Schools

Dave Thomas Education Center West School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
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

Dave Thomas Education Center West

4690 COCONUT CREEK PKWY, Coconut Creek, FL 33063

[no web address on file]

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.

Ensuring we provide students with every opportunity to reach their full potential!

Provide the school's vision statement.

By ALL Means/Opportunities NECESSARY

Academic Opportunities

Career Pathway Opportunities

SEL Opportunities

Dual Enrollment Opportunities

Social Development Opportunities

Peer to Peer Opportunities

Behavioral Development Opportunities

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
Crawford, Synithia	Principal	Translate and guide the school's mission and vision to actionable processes, steps, and programs to meet the SIP requirements for Dave Thomas Education Center West Campus and Charles Drew Family Resource Center.
Rolle, Kenneth	Assistant Principal	Provide insight and direction on SIP as it relates the needs of High School staff and student needs at Dave Thomas Education Center West Campus.
Drayton, Lynnette	Assistant Principal	Provide insight and direction on SIP as it relates the needs of Middle School staff and student needs at the Charles Drew Family Resource Center.
Wright, Antonio	Teacher, ESE	Update components of the SIP

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.

Stakeholders were involved or will be involved in the process of developing and revising the 2023-24 SIP in a variety of ways as follows:

- Leadership Team Meetings to discuss, review, develop, and reflect on SIP components
- Staff, parent, and student eCognia customer survey results disaggregation and reflection
- Parent conferences formal and informal
- SAC composition involvement (Future)
- School reach (Parents and staff)
- Updates will be discussed at SAC/SAF monthly meetings and shared with staff via outlook
- All SIP Component Teams met to update SIP component

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))

SIP Components will be discussed and reflected upon monthly during scheduled SAC meetings or as needed in relation to the district assessment calendar and schoolwide assessment calendar. FAST student data will be discussed frequently and considerations shared with instructional staff by the Principal. The school will revise the plan according to student data findings and student academic deficits and needs. Data chats will be conducted with instructional staff during PLCs and in department meetings. Teachers will conduct individualized data chats with all students. Data chat artifacts will be shared and discussed during SAC 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)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: COMMENDABLE 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	0	2	17	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	21
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	2	27	29

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	2	30	32

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3

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	313
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	300
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	290
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
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	11	39

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	4	294

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	2	143
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	93

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	1	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
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	11	11

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	4	4

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5

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*	9	55	53	0	57	55			
ELA Learning Gains				9					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	8	52	55	2	47	42			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		50	52	0	52	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		68	68	8	64	59			
Middle School Acceleration		72	70		57	51			
Graduation Rate	43	68	74	61	50	50	56		
College and Career Acceleration	6	54	53	11	66	70	9		
ELP Progress	15	53	55	27	75	70	33		

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	16
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	81
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	76
Graduation Rate	43

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	15
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	118
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	62
Graduation Rate	61

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	32	Yes	4	
ELL	18	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	4	4
HSP	25	Yes	4	1
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT	39	Yes	4	
FRL	24	Yes	4	4

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	21	Yes	3	1
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	3	3
HSP	32	Yes	3	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	29	Yes	3	3
FRL	19	Yes	3	3

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	9			8						43	6	15
SWD										6	2	
ELL										0	3	15
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										8	2	
HSP										4	2	

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
MUL												
PAC												
WHT											1	
FRL										6	2	

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	0	9		2			0	8		61	11	27
SWD				0						59	4	
ELL										71	22	27
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				5						66	10	
HSP										53	10	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										50	8	
FRL	0			5						59	10	

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										56	9	33
SWD										75	4	
ELL										40	8	33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										60	10	
HSP										42	0	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										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
FRL										55	7	

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	7%	49%	-42%	50%	-43%
08	2023 - Spring	16%	49%	-33%	47%	-31%
09	2023 - Spring	13%	49%	-36%	48%	-35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	14%	46%	-32%	55%	-41%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	4%	38%	-34%	44%	-40%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	9%	48%	-39%	50%	-41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	0%	46%	-46%	48%	-48%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	6%	63%	-57%	63%	-57%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	6%	62%	-56%	63%	-57%

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.

2022-23 SY

FAST PM3 ELA Reading data shows 12% (11) of 93 tested students demonstrated proficiency at Achievement Levels 3 and 4.

FAST PM3 Grade 10 ELA Reading Off-Grade data shows 10% (17) of 182 students scored achievement level 3 or 4.

FAST PM3 Mathematics data shows 26% (5) of 19 students demonstrated proficiency at Achievement Levels 3 or higher.

Out of three administrations of the BEST Algebra 1 EOC, 10% or 22 of 228 students scored achievement level 3 or above.

Per assessment, students showed the lowest performance in FAST ELA Reading Comprehension.

Contributing Factors

- Students enroll with foundational decoding and reading comprehension skills gaps
- Student chronic attendance issue
- Decrease in student enrollment
- Early release of a certified English Language Arts teacher
- Lack of fidelity to Reading Interventions (Read 180 and System 44)
- Possible lack of systematic instruction and use of student-centered instructional practices
- Appropriateness of differentiation and interventions to meet the needs of diverse learners.
- Data inaccuracies in middle school as a result of student mid-year promotions from grades 7 to 8 and 8 to 9
- Inconsistent progress monitoring and use of data to drive instruction.
- FAST Math data testing was limited to 19 students in grade levels 7-8 during the 2022-23 school year.

Grade 10 FAST ELA Trends

Reading Poetry and Prose (0 students proficient)
Reading Informational Text (4% or 2 students proficient)
Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary (2% or 1 student proficient)

Grade 11 FAST ELA Trends

Reading Poetry and Prose (2% or 1 student proficient)
Reading Informational Text (3% or 2 students proficient)
Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary (0 students proficient)

Grade 12 FAST ELA Trends

Reading Poetry and Prose (1% or 1 student proficient)
Reading Informational Text (3% or 3 students proficient)
Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary (0 students proficient)

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

Notwithstanding the differences of assessments, on the 2022 ELA FSA, 16% or 15 of 92 students demonstrated achievement level 3 or 4.

2023 FAST PM3 ELA Reading data shows 12% (11) of 93 tested students demonstrated proficiency at Achievement Levels 3 and 4.

Proficiency amongst the tested groups of students decreased by 4% points.

Factors contributing to decline:

1. High student attrition and mobility
2. Variances in testing groups
3. Reliability of selected assessments
4. Newness of Assessment
5. Lack of a schoolwide assessment
6. Lack of formative assessments to address student academic deficits immediately
7. Over reliance on summative assessment data to inform decisions
8. Assignment completion vs. skill and content mastery
9. Student reliance on concordant score (ACT, PreSAT, and SAT)

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.

Grade 10 FAST ELA:

Reading Prose & Poetry

Compared to the state in the Reading Prose & Poetry strand, the school achievement level 1 exceeded the state achievement level 1 by 25% points.

Compared to the state in the Reading Prose & Poetry strand, the school achievement level 2 trailed the state achievement level 2 by 8% points.

Reading Informational Text

Compared to the state in the Reading Informational Text strand, the school achievement level 1 exceeded the state achievement level 1 by 31% points.

Compared to the state in the Reading Informational Text strand, the school achievement level 2 trailed the state achievement level 2 by 12% points.

Compared to the state in the Reading Informational Text strand, the school achievement level 3 trailed the state achievement level 2 by 18% points.

Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary

Compared to the state in the Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary strand, the school achievement level 1 exceeded the state achievement level 1 by 44% points.

Compared to the state in the Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary strand, the school achievement level 2 trailed the state achievement level 2 by 11% points.

Compared to the state in the Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary strand, the school achievement level 3 trailed the state achievement level 3 by 22% points.

Contributing Factors:

National decline in reading comprehension

Lack of focus on the simple definition of reading

Infidelity to reading intervention programs (Read 180 System 44)

No support facilitation for diverse learners (ELLs and ESE)

Lack of reading instruction at grade level

Lack of systematic instructional strategies (close reading, chunking, small group)

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

From FAST ELA PM2 to PM3, students showed the most improvement in achievement level proficiency 3 or higher at 6%. The testing group size also remained somewhat consistent with 128 students testing during PM2 and 123 students testing during PM3.

Actions taken by the school:

1. Testing culture improved as students became familiarized with processes and navigating the assessment.

*Testing coordinator Canvas course and frequent updates via email

2. Teachers administered practice assessments.

3. Data-chats increased student ownership and knowledge of skills and deficits

4. Accurate student feedback was provided

5. Formative assessments improved

6. Reading Interventions were used with more fidelity as students were scheduled for Intensive Reading

7. Progress monitoring was conducted more frequently

8. Adherence to ELA Instructional focus calendar and pacing

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

7-8 Area of Concern:

Despite students historically enrolling with foundational academic deficits in reading comprehension, 21 students scoring Achievement Level 1 in ELA is a major concern. A root cause analysis, systematic instruction, interventions, remediation, and progress monitoring are necessary. PLC teaming and collegial inquiry will be used to make data-driven decisions that drive instruction, examine student artifacts, and assess teacher instructional processes.

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

1. Student growth and proficiency in ELA Reading Comprehension (Assessments: FAST, EOCs, SAT, ACT, and formative)

2. Increase graduation rate and pipeline to college capacity (College and career-ready candidates)

3. Systematic instruction (Research-based, standards-based, student-centered, grade-level, high-expectations, rigorous, mastery of skills and content)

4. Student Attendance

5. Behavior Incident reduction as a result of engaging, challenging, innovative instruction

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Historic average testing group proficiency of less than 23% of examined students on ELA assessments and the current FAST ELA PM3 necessitates research-based student centered instructional practices aimed to deepen student standards-based skill and content knowledge in the area of English Language Arts specifically in the 10th grade 21 Achievement level 3 descriptors. Our ESSA subgroups (SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, WHT and FRL), they've been below 41% of the Federal Index for the past 3 years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By Spring 2024, student proficiency for the ESSA subgroups SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, WHT and FRL will increase by 3% points given research-based student-centered instructional practices as measured by the ELA FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

1. Walkthroughs and observations of teaching practices (Marzano's high yield strategies and Hattie's high effect-size strategies)
2. Teacher feedback and reflections
3. Teacher data chats and data disaggregation (PLCs: Teaming and Collegial inquiry)
4. IFC pacing guide
5. HMH Curriculum Growth Assessments
6. District Growth Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Antonio Wright (antonio.wright@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.)

Marzano's High-Yield Strategies: Chunking, small-group instruction, examining similarities and differences, graphic organizers, providing learning goals, testing hypothesis, establishing routines, academic games, providing opportunities for students to talk about what they have learned, probing questions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The evidence-based strategy was selected because it builds and supports pedagogy in a variety of ways. The strategy also serves as the basis of the FTEM teacher observation system. In addition, the strategy ranges in complexity to meet the needs of diverse student groups.

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?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Review 22-23 PM3 data in PLC (ELA/Reading Department)
2. Frequent PLCs (Data chat and disaggregation)
3. Assess students (PM1 and district HMH Growth Measurement Assessments)
4. PLC determine Marzano's strategies based on PM1 and GMA result
5. ELA and Reading teachers implement strategies
6. Conduct frequent walkthroughs
7. Provide teacher feedback on implementation of Marzano instructional practices
8. Assess student content skill and knowledge (PMs, GMAs, and curriculum assessments, formative assessments)
9. Conduct student data chats

Person Responsible: Antonio Wright (antonio.wright@browardschools.com)

By When: According to scheduled PLCs, department meetings, IFC pacing, and assessment calendar (Weekly, daily, and at a moment's notice).

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The area of focus was determined necessary due to ESSA subgroups having severe chronic attendance issue.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, student chronic attendance will decrease by 3% points given tiered attendance support and interventions as measured by district attendance reporting databases.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in BASIS and updated every 20 days by the MTSS Team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Antonio Wright (antonio.wright@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 BASIS MTSS intervention protocol will be used to monitor identified subgroups with chronic attendance issue.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The BASIS MTSS intervention collaborative problem solving systematic, accessible, and relevant to addressing student attendance concerns. The database as a variety of interventions and can be easily monitored. Teachers are also familiar with the format.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Identify students on the system generated attendance list.
2. Create three tier groups based on historical attendance trends.

Tier 1: All enrollees

Tier 2: Students present 3 days

Tier 3: Students present less than 3 days

3. Administer Intervention

Tier 1: Attendance contract

Tier 2: Weekly or biweekly SMART goal/progress plan

Tier 3: Home visit re-engagement

Person Responsible: Antonio Wright (antonio.wright@browardschools.com)

By When: The action steps will be discussed, revised, and implemented at the initial MTSS meeting September 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).

1. The SAC accountability funds balance, school improvement goals, and expenditure conditions are shared with staff via email/agenda item by SAC Chair or Secretary.
2. Staff provide input on how funds should be expended via email or in a scheduled SAC/SAF meeting in relation to SIP schoolwide goals.
3. Staff considerations are conveyed in a list and presented to the SAC/SAF in an open discussion format
4. SAC review staff considerations as an agenda item and tally suggestions into two sample ballots
5. SAC share the sample ballots with staff via email and SAC/SAF meeting
6. SAC vote on a proposed ballot
7. The winning proposed ballot is shared with staff
8. The SAC conduct voting poll and share outcome with staff via email and SAC meeting
9. Funds are expended according to ballot variables and proportions
10. Balance is updated weekly or as needed and communicated to staff via email and agenda item.