Suned High Of South Broward School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Suned High Of South Broward

2744 DAVIE BLVD, Ft Lauderdale, FL 33312

www.sunedhigh.com

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 SunEd High is to provide our students with a safe and nurturing learning environment that will help them achieve their goals--both academically and personally. We believe that by working with families and the community, all students can achieve their maximum potential. We are committed to working together to provide each student with the best possible education while instilling in every student the belief that they can succeed and become responsible, contributing members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of SunEd High is to ensure that students are prepared both socially and academically for their post high school career or educational pathway through the educational, mentoring, and counseling opportunities provided by the school. We envision that our students will become successful members of the community, and who possess a strong academic foundation combined with a set of values and principles that guide their lives in a positive and meaningful way.

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
Lara, Tammy	Principal	-Oversee and organize the gathering of information for the completion of the SIP. -Coordination of the school SAC team to allow for input on completion of the SIP. -Completion of the SIP online in CIMS.
Bianco, Brian	Assistant Principal	Gather and organize information related to student completion rates and academic information.
Korpics, Renata	Instructional Coach	Gather and organize student testing data and progress monitoring data.
Evans, Jerris	Assistant Principal	Monitor and gather report regarding attendance

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.

SunEd High uses a continuous feedback system collecting data from surveys from staff, students, parents, and stakeholders; speaking with parents on parent night and in parent meetings; discussing relationships with stakeholders and how we are view in our community; and accummulating data from day to day events and operations. The School Improvement Team meets three times per year to review this information and create goals each year that meet the needs of our students. We always keep in mind the unique characteristics of our students when making decisions regarding operations, environment, staffing and curriculum needs.

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))

School Improvement is a top priority for SunEd High. Therefore, data is continuously gathered and monitored through a variety of sources. As described above, many stakeholders are providing input several times a year. However, on top of this we are reviewing all progress monitoring data, state testing results, HMH Read 180 results and Edmentum results to determine the effectiveness of the services each student is receiving. It is noted that traditional programs can use subgroup data to make effective decisions on next steps. In SIR schools like ours, our population is continually changing and every student who joins our program comes with a unique set of needs way beyond just academics that must be addressed before the student can truly focus on whats needed with his or her academics. We offer our students a foundational mentoring program, in house mental health therapy services where needed, family economic and financial assistance for important survival needs such as shelter and food, and we have available to us many other community services that we partner with for referral. We take all of this information and include it in our assessment of what the student's needs are as we make an effective educational plan. Although we do look at the achievements, strengths and weaknesses of the subgroups, we have continously found that the individual needs of our students are more accurate in determining what decisions need to be made. The school will review the School Improvement Plan three times per year following test results to make decisions on any changes, deletions or additions that may need to be made.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
Charter School	Yes
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)*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students (BLK)* 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: COMMENDABLE
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	0	0	
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	0	0	
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	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	0	0	

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	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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	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	

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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*	10	50	50		52	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	12	36	38	7	41	38	25		
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		60	64	0	35	40			
Social Studies Achievement*	19	66	66	12	51	48	41		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	12	90	89	10	54	61	17		
College and Career Acceleration	17	61	65	0	66	67	36		
ELP Progress	46	50	45						

* 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	19
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	116
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	89
Graduation Rate	12

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	6
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	29
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	62
Graduation Rate	10

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	9	Yes	2	2
ELL	27	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	11	Yes	2	2
HSP	27	Yes	2	2
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	12	Yes	2	2

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%
FRL	11	Yes	2	2

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	17	Yes	1	1
ELL	7	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	7	Yes	1	1
HSP	13	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	10	Yes	1	1
FRL	6	Yes	1	1

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	10			12				19		12	17	46
SWD											1	
ELL											2	46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK											1	
HSP											2	42
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT											1	
FRL											1	

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				7			0	12		10	0	
SWD										17		
ELL										7		
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										7		
HSP										13		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										10		
FRL										12	0	

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				25				41		17	36	
SWD												
ELL										25		
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										23		
HSP										5		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										15		
FRL										11		

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	14%	49%	-35%	50%	-36%
09	2023 - Spring	0%	49%	-49%	48%	-48%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	5%	48%	-43%	50%	-45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	2%	46%	-44%	48%	-46%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	7%	63%	-56%	63%	-56%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	15%	62%	-47%	63%	-48%

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.

As a SIR school, we use all data to assess below:

Gr. 9-10 FAST ELA Reading
Based on the data shown in the tables below, Gr. 9 students performed the lowest on PM3 of the FAST Reading assessment. Of all the 9th-graders, 89% scored Level 1, 11% scored level 2 and there were no Level 3+ results in either one of these administrations. Their lowest performance was measured on the domain Reading Reading Informational Text, where 85% of them scored Below the Standard.

Comparison of Gr. 9 FAST Reading Data

	PM1 (Baseline)	PM2	PM3
# of Students Tested	15	15	18
Level 1	80%	80%	89%
Level 2	20%	13%	11%
Level 3	0%	7%	0%
Level 4	0%	0%	0%
Level 5	0%	0%	0%

Comparison of Gr. 10 FAST Reading Data

	PM1 (Baseline)	PM2	PM3
# of Students Tested	47	40	52
Level 1	65%	77%	73%
Level 2	21%	13%	13%
Level 3	0%	5%	4%
Level 4	2%	5%	10%
Level 5	2%	0%	0%

FSA ELA Retakes (10th grade -12th grade)
In general, our students scored slightly better on the Fall 2022 FSA ELA Retake Assessment than on the Spring 2023 FSA ELA Retake Assessment. Although the difference in average scale scores is minimal (-0.9 points), the following breakdown reveals a decline.

FSA ELA Retakes	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
# of Students Tested	141	165
Average Score	321.7	320.8
Level 1	66%	73%
Level 2	27%	21%
Level 3	6%	5%
Level 4	1%	1%
Level 5	0%	0%

The table shows that the 93% of the students tested in Fall 2022 performed below expectation as compared to the 94% measured in Spring 2023. In Fall 2022, 7% of the students tested showed mastery as compared to the 6% who passed their assessment in the spring.

HMH Inventories (ALL Grades)
It is evident that PM3 of the HMH Reading Inventory (RI) yielded lower results than the first two administrations of this test. 10% of our students scored "Beginning Reader"; 64% tested "Below Basic", and 21% achieved "Basic" on the Reading Inventory during PM3. Only 4% of our students tested "Proficient" and 1% scored "Advanced" on this test.

Comparison of Reading Inventory Data

PM1 (Baseline) PM2 PM3
# of Students Tested 264 111 137
Average Lexile Score 830 789 672
Beginning Reader 15 (6%) 4 (4%) 14 (10%)
Below Basic 129 (49%) 64 (58%) 87 (64%)
Basic 72 (27%) 31 (28%) 28 (21%)
Proficient 40 (15%) 12 (11%) 6 (4%)
Advanced 8 (3%) 0 (0%) 1 (1%)

In our experience, the reasons behind poor progress monitoring results are as follows:
1) Our at-risk population needs consistent encouragement from past experiences with testing.
2) Test fatigue is evident towards the end of the school year.
3) High transiency in at risk programs. Due to the consistent enrollments throughout the school year of students on the decline in traditional schools, our population is consistently changing.

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

We use all data to assess below:

Gr. 9-10 FAST ELA Reading
Based on the data shown in the tables below, Gr. 9 students performed the lowest on PM3 of the FAST Reading assessment. Of all the 9th-graders, 89% scored Level 1, 11% scored level 2 and there were no Level 3+ results in either one of these administrations. Their lowest performance was measured on the domain Reading Reading Informational Text, where 85% of them scored Below the Standard.

Comparison of Gr. 9 FAST Reading Data

PM1 (Baseline) PM2 PM3
# of Students Tested 15 15 18
Level 1 80% 80% 89%
Level 2 20% 13% 11%
Level 3 0% 7% 0%
Level 4 0% 0% 0%
Level 5 0% 0% 0%

Comparison of Gr. 10 FAST Reading Data

PM1 (Baseline) PM2 PM3
# of Students Tested 47 40 52
Level 1 65% 77% 73%
Level 2 21% 13% 13%
Level 3 0% 5% 4%
Level 4 2% 5% 10%
Level 5 2% 0% 0%

FSA ELA Retakes (10th grade -12th grade)
In general, our students scored slightly better on the Fall 2022 FSA ELA Retake Assessment than on the Spring 2023 FSA ELA Retake Assessment. Although the difference in average scale scores is minimal (-0.9 points), the following breakdown reveals a decline.

FSA ELA Retakes Fall 2022 Spring 2023
# of Students Tested 141 165
Average Score 321.7 320.8
Level 1 66% 73%
Level 2 27% 21%
Level 3 6% 5%
Level 4 1% 1%
Level 5 0% 0%

The table shows that the 93% of the students tested in Fall 2022 performed below expectation as compared to the 94% measured in Spring 2023. In Fall 2022, 7% of the students tested showed mastery as compared to the 6% who passed their assessment in the spring.

HMH Inventories
It is evident that PM3 of the HMH Reading Inventory (RI) yielded lower results than the first two administrations of this test. 10% of our students scored "Beginning Reader"; 64% tested "Below Basic", and 21% achieved "Basic" on the Reading Inventory during PM3. Only 4% of our students tested "Proficient" and 1% scored "Advanced" on this test.

Comparison of Reading Inventory Data

PM1 (Baseline) PM2 PM3
# of Students Tested 264 111 137
Average Lexile Score 830 789 672
Beginning Reader 15 (6%) 4 (4%) 14 (10%)
Below Basic 129 (49%) 64 (58%) 87 (64%)
Basic 72 (27%) 31 (28%) 28 (21%)
Proficient 40 (15%) 12 (11%) 6 (4%)
Advanced 8 (3%) 0 (0%) 1 (1%)

Reading levels continue to improve, nevertheless. This school year, 17% of our students in Intensive Reading successfully met their reading requirement through state or concordant assessments. Furthermore, 15% of our Reading eligible students showed mastery on the HMH Inventories, and consequently, they "tested out" of Reading class. We are convinced through this evidence that the dedication of SESB staff to relentlessly working with our students in a variety of ways ultimately yields great results, such as reading growth or learning gains in general.

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.

Gr. 9-10 FAST ELA Reading
When comparing our data from the 3 FAST ELA Reading administrations, our Grade 9 students' Reading Informational Text scores show the greatest gap when compared to the state average. With no students performing above the standard, the number of students at/near the standard decreased from 33% to 15% (state data reveals that 21% of the students tested scored "Above the Standard" and 57% of them achieved "At/Near the Standard"), and the number of students below the standard increased from 67% to 85% (only 22% of the students in the state tested "Below the Standard").

Gr. 9 FAST ELA Reading PM1 PM2 PM3
Performance Level Above the Standard Above the Standard Above the Standard
At/Near the Standard At/Near the Standard At/Near the Standard
Below the Standard Below the Standard Below the Standard

Reading Prose and Poetry 0% 58% 42% 7% 57% 36% 0% 35% 65%
Reading Informational Text 0% 33% 67% 7% 57% 36% 0% 15% 85%
Reading Across Genres and
Vocabulary 0% 33% 67% 7% 29% 64% 0% 35% 65%

FSA ELA Retakes

As far as the FSA ELA Retakes are concerned, the domain "Integration of Knowledge and Ideas" shows the greatest gap for our students. While a small-scale improvement can be detected in these sub-scores for both Grade 11 and 12 students between test administrations, this domain is still the lowest performing one of all. Students usually lack the skills to work out the connection between ideas and details within the text.

Although our ELA and Reading Departments work hard to help students achieve learning gains, and eventually mastery, throughout the school year, our outcomes are negatively impacted by a variety of factors, such as our high student fluctuation, poor attendance rates and ongoing enrollment. SunEd High of South Broward experiences a significant enrollment and withdrawal wave at the beginning of the school year up until the beginning of October. Apart from trying to counterbalance the negative effects of the summer slide, our staff must make efforts to help our existing and new students to commit to regularly attending school at the beginning of the school year, which limits the time our students have left for review and test prep. This phenomenon recurs mid-year, when a huge number of new students arrive from our feeder schools in December/January, which cuts prep time short for our Reading and ELA Departments yet again. Despite all challenges, our ELA and Reading teachers display fantastic commitment to and deep care for increasing our student outcomes. This year we were fortunate to have the highest passing rates since SESB opened in 2019. Despite all challenges, our ELA and Reading teachers display fantastic commitment to increasing our student outcomes.

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

HMH Inventories
SunEd High of South Broward has always had a large population of students with low reading skills and a history of reading deficiency. They naturally include a relatively large community of ELLs and SWDs. This school year, as the HMH curriculum was implemented, our Literacy/RtI team took the initiative to dissect the data from the HMH Inventories and to use our findings to tailor our help more to the students' individual needs. As a consequence, we restructured our Intensive Reading instruction as well as our RtI process and adapted it to the needs of our constantly fluctuating student population. With a more flexible screening process, the separation of Read180 and System44 classes and a more adaptive implementation of our Tier III instruction, we were able to increase our students' Phonics performance between PM2 and PM3. The proportion of Pre- and Beginning Decoders decreased from 31% to 26%; we maintained the percentage of Developing Decoders at 31%; and although we experienced a mid-year drop in the number of Advancing Decoders due to the huge influx of students in January, we were able to increase this rate to 43% by the end of May.

Comparison of Phonics Inventory Data

PM1 (Baseline) PM2 PM3
# of Students Tested 254 108 132
Average PI Score 22 18 20
Pre-Decoder 3 (1%) 0 (0%) 2 (2%)
Beginning Decoder 50 (20%) 34 (31%) 32 (24%)
Developing Decoder 75 (29%) 33 (31%) 41 (31%)

Advancing Decoder 126 (50%) 41 (38%) 57 (43%)

Gr. 9-10 FAST ELA Reading
The other data component that shows the most improvement is the performance of Grade 10 students across all 3 FAST ELA Reading administrations. They show growth in all 3 aspects of the assessment between PM1 and PM3: in all 3 domains, the number of students performing above standard increased; more students achieved "At/Near the Standard"; and fewer students scored "Below Standard". We attribute this improvement to our flexible HMH screening process, which provides better foundations for our grouping decisions, and thus, our students achieve better results in our exclusively Read180 or System44 classes; furthermore, Grade 10 students had a huge motivating factor pushing them to perform better: meeting the state graduation requirement for Reading at the end of 10th grade.

Gr. 10 FAST ELA Reading
PM1 PM2 PM3
Performance Level Above the Standard Above the Standard Above the Standard
At/Near the Standard At/Near the Standard At/Near the Standard
Below the Standard Below the Standard Below the StandardStandard
Reading Prose and Poetry 2% 45% 53% 0% 47% 53% 4% 50% 46%
Informational Text 0% 51% 49% 2% 38% 60% 4% 48% 48%
Reading Across Genres
and Vocabulary 4% 22% 75% 0% 31% 69% 6% 36% 58%

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

NA

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

SunEd High of South Broward (SESB) is an alternative school for at-risk and low performing students aged 15 to 21. As such, the proportion of certain subgroups is largely indicative of student challenges and potential outcomes.

Since our last progress monitoring analysis, the diverse demographic composition of SunEd High of South Broward has shifted to some extent: 34% of our students is Black; 47% is Hispanic; 17% is White, 0.3% is Native American, 1.6% is Asian, and .9% is Multiracial. As far as genders are concerned, the student population is comprised of 37% female and 63% male students at this time.

Consequently, our relatively large number of ESOL students has changed as well: LY students make up 13% of the student population, and 2.2% of the students are LFs.

Furthermore, our at-risk status naturally suggests the participation of economically disadvantaged students as well outside of ESLS students. As far as students' economic background is concerned, now 85% of our students come from underprivileged households. At the time of the analysis, the percentage of homeless students is 0.03%, and the rate of students in foster care is now .03%. Unfortunately, 22% of our students has some sort of disability, 4.7% have a 504 plan, and 0.6% is gifted.

These background factors predetermine, or at least largely impact, our students' success at state and progress monitoring assessments. We do our very best to make sure that all attending students persevere beyond their challenges and continue to work hard regardless of their age/status.

The progress monitoring data revealed that students still struggle with multiple challenges, which impact their reading skills and, as a result, their overall academics. Students choosing to invest more time into

their job obligations than their academic progress or losing interest in high school education maintain poor attendance and create a disruption in their own education, which naturally results in delayed academic success. Moreover, students have the tendency to prioritize their core classes over their Intensive Reading class. Class avoidance and their general lack of interest in Reading makes it a challenge to ensure the consistency and success of Reading instruction and interventions. SESB strives to support students' social-emotional needs to uncover the root of students' challenges and continues to provide our student population with a variety of resources and tools to turn around these tendencies. Moreover, SESB has taken the RtI/MTSSS process and its implementation to the next level, addressing behavioral, academic and attendance issues, and provides relevant trainings, including the PLC geared toward RtI, to our educators to increase learning gains, student interaction with and understanding of the learning materials, attendance, and students' academic performance, course completion rates as well as graduation rates.

It is also very important to note that the data collected here in the SIP model from the state data base is reflective of 9th and 10th grade students. On average, SunEd High's student body is only 20% 9th and 10th grade students. This is why we use all data.

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 Black/African-American

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 discussed in the previous section, state data only represents a very small percentage of the student body. However, in the Black/African-american subgroup, students continue to demonstrate below standard skills in ELA/Reading test results. This is evident in both state testing as well as the progress monitoring data. To be more accurate on creating goals that represent a larger portion of the subgroup identified, we will use the progress monitoring data to measure need. During the 22-23 SY, Black/African-american students improved their reading scores from 10% to 7% proficiency as indicated by the HMH Read 180 Demographic Growth Report. However, the basic group increase from 17% to 24%. This validates that this subgroup is in need of continued intervention and monitoring in the area of ELA/ Reading.

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

By June 2024, students identified in the Black/African-american subgroup will improve their ELA/Reading skills by 5 percentage points from 7% to 12%.

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

Test results gathered in the areas of ELA/Reading from HMH Read 180, FAST Testing and ELA/FSA Retakes will be reviewed three times per year to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Interventions will implemented using the HMH Read 180/System 44 researched-based reading program.

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

The HMH Read180/System 44 researched-based reading program has been approved from implementation through our sponsoring school district. During the 2022-2023SY, we noted continued improvement of students skills for students who implemented the program with accuracy and diligence.

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.

Students will be assigned to the reading intervention course based on their reading inventory results.

Person Responsible: Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.com)

By When: Within the first two week transitional period of enrollment.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

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 discussed in the previous section, state data only represents a very small percentage of the student body. However, in the White subgroup, students continue to demonstrate below standard skills in ELA/ Reading test results. This is evident in both state testing as well as the progress monitoring data. To be more accurate on creating goals that represent a larger portion of the subgroup identified, we will use the progress monitoring data to measure need. During the 22-23 SY, White students improved their reading scores from 7% to 0% proficiency as indicated by the HMH Read 180 Demographic Growth Report. However, the basic group sustained at 14%. This validates that this subgroup is in need of continued intervention and monitoring in the area of ELA/Reading.

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

By June 2024, students identified in the Hispanic subgroup will improve their ELA/Reading skills by 10 percentage points from 0% to 10%.

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

Test results gathered in the areas of ELA/Reading from HMH Read 180, FAST Testing and ELA/FSA Retakes will be reviewed three times per year to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Interventions will implemented using the HMH Read 180/System 44 researched-based reading program.

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

The HMH Read180/System 44 researched-based reading program has been approved from implementation through our sponsoring school district. During the 2022-2023SY, we noted continued improvement of students skills for students who implemented the program with accuracy and diligence.

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.

Students will be assigned to the reading intervention course based on their reading inventory results.

Person Responsible: Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.com)

By When: Within the first two week transitional period of enrollment.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

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 discussed in the previous section, state data only represents a very small percentage of the student body. However, in the Hispanic subgroup, students continue to demonstrate below standard skills in ELA/Reading test results. This is evident in both state testing as well as the progress monitoring data. To be more accurate on creating goals that represent a larger portion of the subgroup identified, we will use the progress monitoring data to measure need. During the 22-23 SY, Hispanic students maintained their reading scores at 7% proficiency as indicated by the HMH Read 180 Demographic Growth Report. This validates that this subgroup is in need of continued intervention and monitoring in the area of ELA/Reading.

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

By June 2024, students identified in the Hispanic subgroup will improve their ELA/Reading skills by 5 percentage points from 7% to 12%.

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

Test results gathered in the areas of ELA/Reading from HMH Read 180, FAST Testing and ELA/FSA Retakes will be reviewed three times per year to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Interventions will implemented using the HMH Read 180/System 44 researched-based reading program.

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

The HMH Read180/System 44 researched-based reading program has been approved from implementation through our sponsoring school district. During the 2022-2023SY, we noted continued improvement of students skills for students who implemented the program with accuracy and diligence.

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.

Students will be assigned to the reading intervention course based on their reading inventory results.

Person Responsible: Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.com)

By When: Within the first two week transitional period of enrollment.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

As discussed in the previous section, state data only represents a very small percentage of the student body. However, in the Students with Disabilities subgroup, students continue to demonstrate below standard skills in ELA/Reading test results. This is evident in both state testing as well as the progress monitoring data. To be more accurate on creating goals that represent a larger portion of the subgroup identified, we will use the progress monitoring data to measure need. During the 22-23 SY, Students with Disabilities students declined their reading scores from 11% to 8% proficiency as indicated by the HMH Read 180 Demographic Growth Report. High fluctuation due to massive new enrollment may explain this. However the scores are still low. This validates that this subgroup is in need of continued intervention and monitoring in the area of ELA/Reading.

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

By June 2024, students identified in the Students with Disabilities subgroup will improve their ELA/Reading skills by 5 percentage points from 8% to 13%.

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

Test results gathered in the areas of ELA/Reading from HMH Read 180, FAST Testing and ELA/FSA Retakes will be reviewed three times per year to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Interventions will be implemented using the HMH Read 180/System 44 researched-based reading program

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

The HMH Read180/System 44 researched-based reading program has been approved from implementation through our sponsoring school district. During the 2022-2023SY, we noted continued improvement of students skills for students who implemented the program with accuracy and diligence.

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.

Students will be assigned to the reading intervention course based on their reading inventory results.

Person Responsible: Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.com)

By When: Within the first two week transitional period of enrollment.

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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 discussed in the previous section, state data only represents a very small percentage of the student body. However, in the English Language Learners, students continue to demonstrate below standard skills in ELA/Reading test results. This is evident in both state testing as well as the progress monitoring data. To be more accurate on creating goals that represent a larger portion of the subgroup identified, we will use the progress monitoring data to measure need. During the 22-23 SY, English Language Learners students improved their reading scores from 11% to 17% proficiency as indicated by the HMH Read 180 Demographic Growth Report. This validates that this subgroup is in need of continued intervention and monitoring in the area of ELA/Reading.

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

By June 2024, students identified in the English Language Learners subgroup will improve their ELA/ Reading skills by 5 percentage points from 17% to 22%.

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

Test results gathered in the areas of ELA/Reading from HMH Read 180, FAST Testing and ELA/FSA Retakes will be reviewed three times per year to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Interventions will be implemented using the HMH Read 180/System 44 researched-based reading program

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

The HMH Read180/System 44 researched-based reading program has been approved from implementation through our sponsoring school district. During the 2022-2023SY, we noted continued improvement of students skills for students who implemented the program with accuracy and diligence.

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.

Students will be assigned to the reading intervention course based on their reading inventory results.

Person Responsible: Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.com)

By When: Within the first two week transitional period of enrollment.

#6. 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.

Students in all subgroups continue to demonstrate below standard skills in Mathematics. This is evident in both state testing as well as the progress monitoring data. To be more accurate on creating goals that represent a larger portion of the student population, we will use the overall school percentages for the 2023 Statewide Assessment data to measure need. During the 22-23 SY, 5% of students demonstrated proficiency on the Algebra EOC. This validates that all subgroups are in need of continued intervention and monitoring in the area of Algebra.

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

.By June 2024, students will improve their Algebra EOC skills by 5 percentage points from 5% to 10%.

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

Test results gathered in the area of Algebra from FAST Testing and FSA/EOC Retakes will be reviewed three times per year to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Interventions will implemented using the IXL and Gizmos researched-based math intervention program.

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

The IXL and Gizmos researched-based math intervention programs have been approved from implementation through our sponsoring school district. During the 2022-2023SY, we noted continued improvement of students skills for students who implemented the program with accuracy and diligence.

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

#7. 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.

Students in all subgroups continue to demonstrate below standard skills in Mathematics. This is evident in both state testing as well as the progress monitoring data. To be more accurate on creating goals that represent a larger portion of the student population, we will use the overall school percentages for the 2023 Statewide Assessment data to measure need. During the 22-23 SY, 2% of students demonstrated proficiency on the Geometry EOC. This validates that all subgroups are in need of continued intervention and monitoring in the area of Geometry.

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

By June 2024, students will improve their Geometry EOC skills by 5 percentage points from 2% to 7%.

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

Test results gathered in the area of Geometry from FAST Testing and FSA/EOC will be reviewed three times per year to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Interventions will implemented using the IXL and Gizmos researched-based math intervention program.

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

The IXL and Gizmos researched-based math intervention programs have been approved from implementation through our sponsoring school district. During the 2022-2023SY, we noted continued improvement of students skills for students who implemented the program with accuracy and diligence.

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

#8. 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.

Students in all subgroups continue to demonstrate below standard skills in Biology. This is evident in both state testing as well as the progress monitoring data. To be more accurate on creating goals that represent a larger portion of the student population, we will use the overall school percentages for the 2023 Statewide Assessment data to measure need. During the 22-23 SY, 7% of students demonstrated proficiency on the Biology EOC. This validates that all subgroups are in need of continued intervention and monitoring in the area of Biology.

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

By June 2024, students will improve their Biology EOC skills by 5 percentage points from 7% to 12%.

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

Test results gathered in the area of Biology NGSSS EOC will be reviewed three times per year to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Interventions will implemented using Biology EOC prep bootcamps which target Biology EOC standards twice a year.

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

In past years, bootcamps have yeilded higher results on state assessments.

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

#9. 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.

Students in all subgroups continue to demonstrate below standard skills in US History. This is evident in both state testing as well as the progress monitoring data. To be more accurate on creating goals that represent a larger portion of the student population, we will use the overall school percentages for the 2023 Statewide Assessment data to measure need. During the 22-23 SY, 15% of students demonstrated proficiency on the US History EOC. This validates that all subgroups are in need of continued intervention and monitoring in the area of US History.

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

By June 2024, students will improve their US History EOC skills by 4 percentage points from 15% to 19%.

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

Test results gathered in the area of US History NGSSS EOC will be reviewed three times per year to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Interventions will implemented using US History EOC prep bootcamps which target US History EOC standards twice a year.

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

Implementation of bootcamps in past years has yielded higher test results every implementation.

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

#10. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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.

Unfortunately, the state data regarding graduation rate for SIR schools is not indicative of what is actually happening in our programs as graduation rate is measured by students in cohourt. What needs to be addressed, is that most students that come to us are out of cohourt or overaged and so far behind in their credit completions that they are unable to graduate in cohourt. This is true for most of the students at SunEd High. With this said, SunEd High strives to improve the graduation rate each year by targeting specific needs of students who are close to graduation and still in cohourt. This is true for 11th graders specifically who can finish needed courses at a faster pace than if they stayed in a traditional program.

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

By June 2024, SunEd High will increase the graduation rate by 5 percentage points from 10% to 15%.

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

Graduation plans are reviewed monthly by the guidance counselor and the mentors. Specific interventions will be implemented where needed

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Student by student mentoring and services implementation where needed helps students stay on track for graduation. Being informed and understanding expectations breeds success.

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

SunEd High has experienced much success through the implementation of the mentoring program in all areas including raising the graduation rate.

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

#11. 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.

Unfortunately, majority of student who attend SunEd High come with a plethra of challenges going on their lives.
These challenges tend to affect their attendance as life experience has been difficult for them and their school life has not been a priority. With this said, SunEd High strives to improve student attendance each year by targeting specific needs of students who have work challenges, relationship strains with parents or loved ones, ecominic challenges and day care challenges. We do this through the variety of services we offer to include mentoring, mental health and socioeconomic support, and community services to include Broward 211. We work diligently as a team to find solutions that allow our students to feel safe, wanted and suported as a student at SunEd.

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

By June 2024, SunEd High will increase the attendance rate by 5 percentage points from 45% to 51%.

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

Attendance reports are reviewed monthly by the guidance counselor, Assistant Principal and the mentors. Specific interventions will be implemented where needed. Flexible schedules will be offered to students required to work to support themselves. Home visits will be a part of severe cases.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Lara (tlara@sunedhigh.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.)

Student by student mentoring and services implementation where needed helps students solve issues to increase attendance. Being informed and understanding expectations breeds success.

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

SunEd High has experienced much success through the implementation of the mentoring program in all areas including raising the attendance rate.

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).

All interventions and areas of need are addressed through the FEFP purchases of intervention programs that are approved by our sponsoring district. The Governing Board and Principal oversee that all purchases for interventions are within the scope of the expectations of our sponsoring school district. Due to the nature of the school and the fact that approximately 80% of the student population are in need of interventions, our priority is implementation of interventions appropriate for every area of need. All interventions are reviewed three times a year for effectiveness and additional interventions are sought out when the current implementation does not yield expected results.

Interventions that are put in place are as follows:
1. HMH/Read180 Intensive Reading Program is built into the students schedule for all students score at a Level 1 or Level 2.
2. IXL Math and Gizmos Mathematics are supplemental intensive math programs assigned to all students who have not passed the Algebra EOC or are struggling with basic mathematics skills.
3. Study Island ELL programs for emerging English language learners and for SAT/ACT prep courses.
4. Foundational mentoring program assigns a mentor to every student attending.
5. Fulltime Licensed Mental Health Therapist is on site all day.

Community Partnerships are in place with the LEAP program who provides tutoring, leadership development, and life skills development to our most vulnerable subgroups. Club Elevate is present for these services three times a week and also works with families to keep them engaged.