

Broward County Public Schools

Henry D Perry Education Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Henry D Perry Education Center

3400 WILDCAT WAY, M IR Amar, FL 33023

[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 Henry D. Perry Education Center is to foster a learning environment that aligns the interest of students to college preparatory or career pathways in support of their post- secondary aspirations.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to strengthen the academic foundation of all learners perpetuating a desire to reach their limitless potential.

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
Baltazar, Kristin	Principal	Leads the entire school community, which includes students, parents, and staff.
Overstreet, Victor	Assistant Principal	
Farris, Lariell	SAC Member	
Daley, Venice	Instructional Coach	
Howell, Ann	Instructional Coach	

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.

School uses various approaches to obtain input from stakeholders for the SIP Plan. Information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Teachers, students, and administration work together to set goals and outline action steps for the SIP Plan. Feedback is solicited throughout the process to ensure that the continuity of the SIP is implemented with fidelity.

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 through monthly SIP meetings with all stakeholders including the leadership team and SAC Committee. Check points will be created to monitor the results of each goal along with measuring the impact towards the attainment of the over goal. We prioritize fidelity and implementation to ensure that the goals are obtained and reached. The plan revisited when goals have not been obtained in accordance with the SIP Plan.

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-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	89%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
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) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL)* 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: MAINTAINING 2017-18: 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	10	46	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	35	43	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	27	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	22	
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	5	5	

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	8	40	48

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	1	26	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	27

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	6	28	1322
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	221
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	179
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	155
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	2	5	16

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	5	29	790

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	1	7	338
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	285

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	6	28	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	19
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	2	5	7

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	5	29	34

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	1	7	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	13

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*		55	53	0	57	55	0		
ELA Learning Gains							25		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		52	55	3	47	42	9		
Math Learning Gains							38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		50	52	7	52	54	14		
Social Studies Achievement*		68	68	18	64	59	25		
Middle School Acceleration		72	70		57	51			
Graduation Rate	26	68	74	26	50	50	25		
College and Career Acceleration	10	54	53	10	66	70	9		
ELP Progress	25	53	55	33	75	70	30		

** 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	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	61
Total Components for the Federal Index	3

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	26

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	14
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	97
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	54
Graduation Rate	26

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	20	Yes	4	4
ELL	19	Yes	4	4
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	18	Yes	4	4
HSP	17	Yes	4	4
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	15	Yes	4	4
FRL	18	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	12	Yes	3	3
ELL	24	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	14	Yes	3	3
HSP	27	Yes	3	3
MUL	17	Yes	3	3
PAC				
WHT	19	Yes	3	3
FRL	17	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										26	10	25
SWD										3	2	
ELL											2	25
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										9	2	
HSP										13	3	13
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										8	2	
FRL										10	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			3			7	18		26	10	33
SWD				0						20	16	
ELL										32	7	33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				0				17		33	6	
HSP								45		20	10	31
MUL										17		
PAC												
WHT										18	19	
FRL										24	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	0	25		9	38		14	25		25	9	30
SWD				0				8		18	0	
ELL										36	4	30
AMI												
ASN										40		
BLK	0	45		5	50		7	18		26	8	
HSP	0	10		17				38		25	8	31
MUL										32	9	
PAC												
WHT										20	20	
FRL				13				25		23	10	

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	10%	49%	-39%	50%	-40%
07	2023 - Spring	13%	49%	-36%	47%	-34%
08	2023 - Spring	13%	49%	-36%	47%	-34%
09	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	48%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	16%	51%	-35%	48%	-32%
08	2023 - Spring	4%	46%	-42%	55%	-51%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	11%	38%	-27%	44%	-33%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	3%	48%	-45%	50%	-47%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	3%	46%	-43%	48%	-45%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	15%	63%	-48%	63%	-48%

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

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	62%	-43%	63%	-44%

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.

FSA ELA is the area in need of greatest improvement. Students are enrolling prior reading deficiencies and many are chronically absent from school. Closing the achievement gap is difficult when students are at various levels of mastery and may not be attending regularly.

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

FSA ELA and Algebra1 EOC continue to be areas of focus as students are enrolling without passing scores on required assessments.

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.

There was a learning gap for both ELA and Math due to students performing below grade level standards on the FAST assessments. Chronic attendance issues and other outside entities outside of school that prevented students from attending school to receive the necessary guided and direct instruction that would assist with preparing them to take the state assessment tests.

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

There was improvement in both our FSA ELA and Math Data. For math there was improvement for our middle school student scores in the areas of Algebraic Reasoning and Linear Relationship Data Analysis. There was also improvement for FSA ELA in the following areas Reading Informational Text.

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

NOTE: Only complete this section for the data for grades 7-8. 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.

Increase the overall graduation rate

Improve overall student attendance

Close the academic achievement gap by improving and increasing overall assessment scores on state assessments required for graduation.

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As an alternative middle/ high school, teacher recruitment and retention can often be problematic. Creating a system that positively promotes our programs will allow for recruitment of highly qualified teachers. New teacher mentoring and peer support will assist with retention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At this time all classroom vacancies have been filled with highly qualified instructional staff. The goal is for 100% of instructional staff members to stay for the 2023-2024 school year and return for the 2024- 2025 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through the observances of instructional staff resignations and/or transfers resulting in vacancies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victor Overstreet (victor.overstreet@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 will utilize the Teacher Induction for Effectiveness and Retention (TIER) Program and teacher feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The researched based- program provides weekly support to new teachers and leads to a more trusting and supportive environment.

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.

Continue to provide assistance to all instructional staff that will assist them with providing direct and effective instruction to students which will also assist students in meeting graduation requirements.

Person Responsible: Victor Overstreet (victor.overstreet@browardschools.com)

By When: At the end of the 2023- 2024 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**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 FSA -ELA and Algebra 1 EOC results this is a critical need. If the students are not engaged, then their performance on standardized tests will be negatively impacted.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student attendance, number of credits submitted, standardized test scores, and formative assessments will be used to measure student engagement. The academic support team will be an instrumental tool in increasing student engagement by utilizing small groups, push-ins , and pull-outs. Student data chats are another component that will be utilized to increase student achievement.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance reports from Life Skills and Wellness Team (LSW), leadership meeting discussions centered around attendance and credit submission, and discussion of assessment scores(Mastery Connect, Formative and summative assessments, and standardized tests) will be utilized and analyzed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victor Overstreet (victor.overstreet@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.)

Academic Support Teachers, Instructional Coaches, and Graduation Coaches will utilize push-ins and pull-outs across all campuses. The evidence based strategies that will be implemented are scaffolding, gradual release, and differentiated instructions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Henry D. Perry Education Center has created an academic support team that consist of graduation coaches, instructional coaches, and academic support teachers to address the specific needs of our at-risk- learners.

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.

The academic support and leadership team will utilize formative and summative assessments to monitor achievement levels of students who receive additional academic support.

Person Responsible: Victor Overstreet (victor.overstreet@browardschools.com)

By When: Academic reviews will take place bi-weekly and monthly.

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 discussed during monthly SAC meetings and the allocations of these funds is voted on by the SAC Committee. The use of funds is utilize across all campuses and programs.