Florida Atlantic University - College of Education

A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High School

777 GLADES RD BLDG 26, Boca Raton, FL 33431

www.adhus.fau.edu

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the FAU Lab Sch County School Board on 9/20/2023.

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.

A.D. Henderson University School and FAU High School endeavors to: (1) demonstrate best practices in teacher education; (2) innovate, develop, and provide students with a challenging curriculum, balanced with innovative academic support; and (3) conduct and support emerging educational research.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Alexander D. Henderson University School/FAU High School (ADHUS/FAUHS) is a national exemplary model for school systems and teacher preparation programs improving education for diverse student populations through innovative, faculty-developed research and curriculum.

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
Herbst, Joel	Principal	Superintendent
Robinson, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Elementary Assistant Principal
Hallstrom, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	High School Assistant Principal
Hoff, Cornelia	Assistant Principal	Middle School Assistant Principal
Cook, Tamara	Behavior Specialist	Behavior and Assessment Coordinator
Hufty, Gina	Instructional Coach	Instructional Facilitator
Simzer, Ana	Instructional Coach	Instructional Facilitator

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.

Each year, the school's leadership team, which includes the principal, assistant principals, instructional facilitators, ESE coordinators, student behavior coordinator, and the school counseling director, analyzes student data from statewide and school assessment from the previous year to determine the School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals for the follow year. Level administrators take goals and expectations to their respective teams, which includes teachers and other instructional staff, to determine the activities that will help to achieve the current year's goals. The full SIP is then drafted and shared with all school staff for input. Finally, the plan is discussed at an open and public School Advisory Body meeting, which consists of teachers, community business members, parents, and students, for additional input and approval.

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 leadership team regularly reviews student data from schoolwide progress monitoring assessments and from the FAST progress monitoring assessments to determine progress toward reaching the stated goals. Assistant principals lead data chats with team leaders and conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure activities outlined in the SIP are occurring regularly and with fidelity. The Leadership Team meets quarterly with the principal to review student and classroom walkthrough data to determine if an adjustment in activities outlined in the SIP, classroom instruction, student interventions, professional learning, or coaching needs to be made to ensure goal attainment.

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 KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	23%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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	2021-22: A

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	2	5	1	5	4	2	3	4	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3
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	

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	1	0	1

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	2	6	4	4	4	2	1	5	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	4	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	

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	2	2	6	4	4	4	2	1	5	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	4	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	94	82	53	93	80	55	91		
ELA Learning Gains				76			77		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				74			77		
Math Achievement*	97	84	55	92	59	42	86		
Math Learning Gains				80			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				85			60		
Science Achievement*	94	82	52	92	81	54	87		
Social Studies Achievement*	97	92	68	99	73	59	93		
Middle School Acceleration	92	86	70	92	65	51	79		
Graduation Rate	100	100	74	100	77	50	100		
College and Career Acceleration	100	100	53	100	93	70	100		
ELP Progress		65	55		92	70			

** 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	96
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	764
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	89
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	983
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

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	78			
ELL	94			
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	96			
HSP	95			
MUL	92			
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	97			
FRL	93			

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	66			
ELL	80			
AMI				
ASN	97			
BLK	83			
HSP	93			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	88			
FRL	85			

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	94			97			94	97	92	100	100	
SWD	68			89			64				4	
ELL	88			100							2	
AMI												
ASN	97			97			98		73	100	6	
BLK	90			91			90	100	100	100	7	
HSP	94			98			95	90	94	100	8	

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	91			90			94				3	
PAC												
WHT	96			99			94	100	92	100	8	
FRL	88			92			90	100	92	100	8	

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	93	76	74	92	80	85	92	99	92	100	100	
SWD	55	69	68	62	75	74	57					
ELL	88	55		94	82							
AMI												
ASN	97	85	91	100	100		100			100	100	
BLK	90	75	74	83	66	69	83	93	80	100	100	
HSP	94	77	82	95	87	97	95	100	97	100	100	
MUL	90	78		88	70		100					
PAC												
WHT	93	72	67	92	79	86	89	100	92	100	100	
FRL	89	72	72	86	77	77	82	96	87	100	100	

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	91	77	77	86	57	60	87	93	79	100	100	
SWD	28	31	26	34	41	38	21					
ELL	77	85	100	81	40							
AMI												
ASN	98	89	94	91	57		95			100	100	
BLK	81	62	60	69	45	44	76	90	73	100	100	
HSP	94	83	85	88	62	64	87	100	71	100	100	
MUL	90	76		89	67		85					
PAC												
WHT	92	76	73	90	59	67	90	88	82	100	100	

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	83	70	70	78	48	52	71	88	74	100	100	

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	99%	99%	0%	50%	49%
05	2023 - Spring	97%	79%	18%	54%	43%
07	2023 - Spring	90%	76%	14%	47%	43%
08	2023 - Spring	83%	74%	9%	47%	36%
09	2023 - Spring	99%	99%	0%	48%	51%
04	2023 - Spring	94%	81%	13%	58%	36%
06	2023 - Spring	92%	81%	11%	47%	45%
03	2023 - Spring	90%	79%	11%	50%	40%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	90%	10%	54%	46%
07	2023 - Spring	95%	62%	33%	48%	47%
03	2023 - Spring	97%	84%	13%	59%	38%
04	2023 - Spring	99%	87%	12%	61%	38%
08	2023 - Spring	95%	88%	7%	55%	40%
05	2023 - Spring	97%	79%	18%	55%	42%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	84%	76%	8%	44%	40%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	96%	79%	17%	51%	45%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	89%	8%	50%	47%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	100%	0%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	100%	0%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	92%	5%	66%	31%

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.

Performance in most areas improved compared with 2022 data. Only 2 areas showed a slight decline, Social Studies and Science. However, achievement in those areas were 97% and 90%, respectively. The slight 2% decline (from 99%) in Social Studies may be due to a change in instructors.

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

There were only slight decreases in achievement data compared with last year. Science and Social Studies achievement each dropped by 2 percentage points

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 results of the statewide assessments showed the largest gap in ELA when students with disabilities were compared to students without disabilities. The school's gap on this component is 32 points. Sixty four percent of students with disabilities scored Level 3 or higher, compared with 96% of students without disabilities. This is a 9 point improvement from last school year.

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

Students with disabilities (SWDs) showed the most improvement of all subgroups in both English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics compared with 2022. Overall, SWDs improved 9 percentage points in ELA and 26 percentage points in math. A keen focus on providing early and frequent interventions for all students who struggle contributed to improvement in 2023.

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

Although school-wide ELA data showed 94% of students scoring level 3 and above, middle school ELA is one area that will be targeted for improvement. There are no other data within the EWS indicating a need for targeted improvement.

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

Priorities for school improvement include the following:
Increase the percentage of students who score level 4 and above on the 2024 FAST statewide assessment.
Decrease the number of referrals by continued training and implementation of character and resiliency education.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Historically, well over 90% of the students score Level 3 and above on statewide assessments in English Language Arts (ELA). A Level 3 indicates “on-grade level” and could indicate that the student may need additional support for the next grade or course. However, an achievement level of 4 indicates that the student is “proficient” or likely to excel in the next grade or course, and Level 5 indicates “mastery.” The focus is to increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 and above while continuing to support students who are not meeting grade level expectations.

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

At least 70% of elementary students (grades 3-5), 76% of middle school students (grades 6-8) and 100% of high school students (grades 9-10) will earn a Level 4 or above as indicated on the English Language Arts PM-3 results of the 2024 F.A.S.T. assessment.

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

School administrators and team leaders will monitor progress on the implementation of strategies and assessments through classroom walkthroughs, data chats, and grade level and team meetings.
The school's comprehensive evidence-based reading plan decision tree will guide the instruction, progress monitoring, and intervention process.

Progress toward this goal will be measured by the results on the ELA F.A.S.T. PM-1 and PM-2 assessments, along with district progress monitoring data (iReady and CommonLit) and other grade-specific data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joel Herbst (jherbst1@fau.edu)

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.)

Utilize designated daily intervention time for ELA and ongoing progress monitoring through MTSS. Grades kindergarten through grade 5 will use iReady to monitor progress.
Kindergarten through third grade teachers will also use Wilson’s Fundations for Tier 1 phonics instruction, with a more intensive intervention model implemented for students who require Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions. Middle school teachers will use standards-aligned assessments to determine individual gaps in performance and remediate as necessary during and after school

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Many studies support the use of an explicit, systematic, and multisensory approach to instruction in phonological awareness and phonics, see two IES meta-analyses that support this claim here and here. In addition to the research cited, these essential skills are highlighted in Florida’s new ELA B.E.S.T. Standards as part of the cornerstones of reading.

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.

Kindergarten through Grade 5:
1) Use the F.A.S.T. assessment data during PM-1 to establish a baseline and monitor student progress.
2) Identify student needs through the MTSS process
a. Monthly school-based team (SBT) meetings
b. Daily What-I-Need (WIN) groups that target remediation and acceleration
c. Continuous progress monitoring
3) Continue coaching cycles and literacy walks to support instruction.
4) Implement after school tutoring in reading when necessary.
5) Engage parents in their children's literacy (Literacy Night, Read-at-home project, New Worlds Reading Initiative).

Person Responsible: Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

By When: May 2024

Grades 6-8
1) Utilize multiple data points for progress monitoring from CommonLit and No Red Ink.
2) Focus middle school PLCs on the implementation of a workshop approach for reading and ELA instruction and engaging students in academic discourse.
3) Implement academic interventions through after school tutoring to support students identified as having deficiencies in one or more standards based on multiple data sources.
4) Analyze classroom walkthroughs and coaching cycles to support effective instructional and engagement strategies used in classrooms.

Person Responsible: Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

By When: May 2024

Grades 9 and 10
1) Utilize progress monitoring data along with classroom data and grades to assess progress and plan for support.
2) Use F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data to identify ELA standards that indicate lowest proficiency and offer targeted support.
3) Implement data chats with teachers, administration, and school counselors to initiate an intervention plan that includes tutoring and monitoring.
4) Establish bi-weekly monitoring and adjust the intervention plan as needed.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Hallstrom (khallstrom@fau.edu)

By When: May 2024

#2. 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.

More than 90% of the students scored Level 3 or above on statewide assessments in mathematics for the past two years. While Level 3 indicates “on-grade level” it may also indicate that the student may need additional support for the next grade or course. However, a Level 4 achievement indicates that the student is “proficient” or likely to excel in the next grade or course, and Level 5 indicates “mastery.” The focus in mathematics is to increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 and above while continuing to support students who are not meeting grade level expectations.

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

At least 85% of elementary students (grades 3-5) and 88% of middle school students (grades 6-8) will earn a Level 4 or above as indicated on the Mathematics PM-3 results of the 2024 F.A.S.T. assessment.

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

F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data as well as iReady and ALEKS data will be used to monitor students’ grade level progress. School administrators and team leaders utilize quarterly data chats, classroom walkthroughs, classroom-level data analysis, and grade level and team meeting feedback to monitor progress on the implementation of strategies and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joel Herbst (jherbst1@fau.edu)

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.)

Use math assessment data from F.A.S.T. progress monitoring and from iReady to identify students in need of intervention. Math interventions will focus on proficient problem solving models, guided practice with feedback, and ongoing cumulative review (IES Practice Guide)

In grades 5 through 8, Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) software, which is based on Knowledge Space Theory, provides an exact and comprehensive description of students’ competence in math with a list of topics that students are ready to learn.

Students who are identified as struggling to meet grade level expectations will be provided in-class assistance, interventions, and after-school tutoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted mathematics instructional strategies using rich contexts, discovery, and explicit instruction that are individualized based on student needs are aligned with evidence-based, best practices for struggling 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.

Kindergarten through Grade 5
1) Use math assessment data from F.A.S.T. as well as iReady and classroom assessments to monitor progress.
2) Identify student needs through the MTSS process that includes: Monthly SBT meetings; Daily What-I-Need (WIN) groups that target remediation and acceleration; Response to intervention tracking
3) Provide training and support for the implementation of a workshop approach for teaching math in order to provide multiple opportunities to reach the diverse needs of learners
4) Utilize a math specialist to provide interventions and classroom support for students not mastering grade level content in Kindergarten through grade 4.
5) Establish a math night to support parent involvement to help support their student's progress in math with an in-person or virtual math night for parents.

Person Responsible: Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

By When: May 2024

Grades 6-8
1) Analyze F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessment data to identify student deficiencies across grade level mathematics standards.
2)Use ALEKS placement/diagnostic data to place students on a pathway to master the grade level content.
3) Provide students with after-school academic support that is focused on targeted skills.
4) Implement a workshop approach for teaching math to provide increased opportunities to reach the diverse needs of learners
5) Offer a dual enrollment math course for qualified middle school students.

Person Responsible: Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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.

Character Counts! is one of the most widely used character education frameworks in the country. Research shows that having a quality character education program decreases behavior issues and improves academic performance.

Character Counts was implemented during the 22-23 school year. Because behavioral expectations were more focused and aligned with the framework outlined in the Character Counts curriculum, consequences for not meeting those expectations increased. In all, there were a total of 563 referrals written for students: 474 were teacher/classroom referral; 89 escalated to administrator referrals.

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

Using baseline student referral data from 2022-2023, teacher/classroom level referrals and administrative referrals will each decrease by 10% (427 and 80, respectively) by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

School administrators, instructional facilitators, and the Student Behavior Coordinator will utilize classroom/school walkthroughs, student discipline data, and grade level and team meeting feedback to monitor student behavior.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joel Herbst (jherbst1@fau.edu)

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.)

Classroom teachers will implement Character Counts! daily lessons with fidelity. Expected behaviors will be reinforced and rewarded throughout the school day in a variety of contexts. Classroom teachers along with the behavior specialist will provide interventions as needed. School counselors will reinforce expected behaviors through interventions and small group lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Practices that research (see IES Practice Guide) has shown to reduce problem behaviors include teaching and reinforcing new skills to increase appropriate behavior. In addition, adopting a schoolwide approach to prevent problem behaviors and increase positive interactions may also be used to reduce problematic behaviors. To meet these recommendations, the school will continue to implement Character Counts! schoolwide, with interventions provided using Navigate 360 in middle school.

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) Provide refresher training by Character Counts trainers on the 6 pillars for continued school-wide implementation and include a focused workshop on managing difficult behaviors for instructional personnel.
2) Use common language and expectations in all areas of the school.
3) Reinforce desired behavior with visual reminders and communication throughout the school and classrooms.
4) Provide monthly student incentives and rewards to increase engagement and reinforce expectations.
5) Implement Navigate360 for instruction in resiliency education in middle school and as a vehicle to provide behavioral interventions school-wide.

Person Responsible: Tamara Cook (tcookwashington@fau.edu)

By When: May 2024