

Broward County Public Schools

North Broward Academy Of Excellence Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

North Broward Academy Of Excellence Middle

8200 SW 17TH ST, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

northbrowardcharter.org

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.

Our mission is to provide high quality education in a safe, respectful and academic environment that builds a foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will be a community where all scholars feel loved, respected, and encouraged to develop to their fullest potential.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Satchell-Simpson, Karen	Assistant Principal	Principal. Leader of the campus and ensures implementation of the SIP plan is met.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders, including teachers, school staff, parents, families, students and community stakeholders, are all involved in implementing the SIP plan development process. Stakeholders are invited to attend SAC meetings where they can provide their input on academic goals, behavior interventions, and all-around school improvement. Stakeholders are also provided with opportunities to provide input in the SIP development process by attending/participating in the following -

- * Parent Academies (online and in person)
- * Local Decision Making FORMS QR - Allow for stakeholders to input ideas/suggestions for the school
- * School Website - northbrowardcharter.org

SIP Monitoring

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

SIP Plan will be monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students by the following -

- * SIP plan will be part of the leadership agenda meeting
- * Monitor student achievement by reviewing IFC data and FAST data of the lowest 25% in both Math and Reading, focusing on our ELL and ESE population.
- * Interventionist will monitor post and pre-assessments and complete a data tracker

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	72%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	12	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	9	20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	36	32	103
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	17	16	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	8	22

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	8	29	34	71

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	49	53	49	53	54	50	56		
ELA Learning Gains				55			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			47		
Math Achievement*	62	56	56	62	41	36	42		
Math Learning Gains				74			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			17		
Science Achievement*	50	50	49	45	52	53	49		
Social Studies Achievement*	67	67	68	83	63	58	57		
Middle School Acceleration	91	70	73	85	51	49	65		
Graduation Rate					49	49			
College and Career Acceleration					70	70			
ELP Progress	10	42	40		74	76			

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	329
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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	18	Yes	4	2
ELL	27	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	64			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	61			

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	64			
HSP	59			

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%
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	64			

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	49			62			50	67	91			10
SWD	12			17			17	25			4	
ELL	29			43							3	10
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52			61			48	69	92		5	
HSP	24			63			53	53	85		5	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	45			57			48	64	89		5	

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	53	55	49	62	74	68	45	83	85			
SWD	6	32	36	15	47	46	0	40				
ELL	32	46	30	64	75							
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	52	53	51	60	74	68	43	82	92			
HSP	52	61	43	61	71		44	80				
MUL	70	70		90	80							
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	51	53	52	62	77	71	49	80	83			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	56	52	47	42	25	17	49	57	65			
SWD	10	45	52	13	21	19		7				
ELL	54	62	55	35	27	20		36				
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	54	50	46	40	24	15	47	54	66			
HSP	62	59	50	45	30	23	57	64	60			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	55	53	47	37	22	16	47	56	63			

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	49%	4%	47%	6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	41%	50%	-9%	47%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	54%	3%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	60%	51%	9%	48%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	46%	3%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	38%	-9%	44%	-15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	48%	36%	50%	34%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	46%	54%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	63%	31%	63%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	64%	3%	66%	1%

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.

6th Grade ELA- 53% of our students scored a level 1 or 2 on the Spring FAST. Some contributing factors include not fully understanding the BEST standards and insufficient training for our ELA teachers. Teachers need support with scaffolding the ELA standards, which are intended to promote literacy by prioritizing the basics of reading and writing.

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

Civics showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The year started with a teacher who resigned mid-year. The teacher who replaced him needed more training in monitoring the progress of standards. The goal proficiency score was 77% however we earned a 66%.

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.

6th grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. There was inconstant use of assessments and interventions for struggling students.

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

6th grade Mathematics shows the most improvement.

When compared to PM1 data, the component that showed the most improvement was 6th-grade mathematics. For PM1, 16% of our students were proficient and by PM3, 66% of our students were proficient. Throughout the school year, this teacher focused on tracking their student's data and ensuring that they were reteaching standards that did not show mastery and had targeted tutoring and small group opportunities for students who required remedial assistance.

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

Reflecting on the Early Warning Systems, attendance and tardiness are the greatest concern. Attendance and tardiness lead to students missing key instruction to help their growth. The school plans to document and send notifications to parents and teachers more accurately to build greater accountability. The school support team will follow up with individual students and families.

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

Focus on instructional software.

Implement data-driven small groups with fidelity in ELA and Math.

Build foundational skills in math

Incorporate engagement strategies that will ensure the individual needs of our students are met

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Losing experienced instructors to teacher turnover has a direct impact on students. A beloved educator can serve as a role model or mentor. For some children, the disappearance of such a figure can be discouraging and result in a loss of engagement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to improve faculty and staff support, working conditions, school culture, peer support, teacher-to-teacher collaboration, and individual and family opportunities. These improvements and enhancements will hopefully limit teacher turnover and will allow us to retain our highly effective, certified teachers.

Monitoring:

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

Staff surveys and staff retention will help us monitor a positive school culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Satchell-Simpson (ksatchellsimpson@northbrowardcharter.org)

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.)

Participate in NEPP (New Educator Prep Program)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

NEPP is designed to help aspiring educators achieve their Florida teacher certification

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Students with disabilities frequently have instructional needs that require additional support from classroom teachers. An area of focus for the school year is to ensure that our Students with Disabilities meet their IEP goals and show growth on statewide assessments. Based on the data the past two years, our SWD scores on FAST/FSA PM3 were below the 41% threshold and did not meet minimum expectations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan on increasing the SWD overall subgroup score on the upcoming FSA/PM3 SY 23/24 from 28% to above 41%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our SWD scores from FAST (PM1 and PM 2) as well as NWEA (Fall and Winter) for ELA, Math, and Science. The curriculum resource teachers will assist the ESE Specialist in collecting the data, placing on a tracker, and for meeting with administration to reievew our progress and make appropriate instructional decisions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Satchell-Simpson (ksatchellsimpson@northbrowardcharter.org)

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.)

For Tier 2, we utilize Lexia Skill Builders, MyFocus, and Progress Learning. SWD that qualify for Tier 2 will recieve Intervention in the classroom 3 times per week. For Tier 3, we utilize Lexia Lessons and iReady Literacy Tasks. SWD that qualify for Tier 3 will recieve Intervention 4 times per week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The evidence based programs will provide remediation on grade level standards.

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.

Create list of all SWD

Person Responsible: Karen Satchell-Simpson (ksatchellsimpson@northbrowardcharter.org)

By When: November 2023

Pull data from FAST PM1, FAST PM2, NWEA Fall and NWEA Winter.

Person Responsible: Karen Satchell-Simpson (ksatchellsimpson@northbrowardcharter.org)

By When: Within 2 weeks of data being made available.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

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.

Creating an environment where students are met at their level with resources and curriculum in order to build foundational skills that will allow students to grow in core subject areas. Small groups allow for the teacher to better understand and differentiate curriculum to meet students' needs and then work with the students to make gains and reach proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Assess needs based on FAST, NWEA and PL assessments. Create groups based on needs of student with clear goals. Plan activities that are aligned with standard and goal. Monitor students' progress and adjust groups when needed.

Monitoring:

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

FAST data, NWEA, instructional software, RTI, reteaching and retesting and tutoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Satchell-Simpson (ksatchellsimpson@northbrowardcharter.org)

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.)

Instructional Software (Lexia, Imagine Math, Progress Learning and Penda).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale behind the usage our school-wide instructional software is that they are all CSUSA approved and recommended.

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)).

The school-based team met with our management company to talk through needs assessment and projected enrollment in order to create purchase requests. Instructional resources were chosen based on their ability to support learning gains for SWD.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

SAC Meeting
School's Webpage
Parent University

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

SAC Meetings
Parent University
Parent/ Teacher Conferences
Open House, Meet and Greet, Fast Forward Nights
Weekly Newsletter
School Webpage
Social Media

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Competency-based learning or personalized learning.
Use of technology in teaching and learning.
New and alternative sources of student support and funding.
Better use of community resources.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The plan includes implementing a rigorous tutoring program that targets our SWD and lowest 25% in reading and math. Interventionists have been hired to service our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

School counselors advocate for the mental health needs of all students by offering instruction that enhances awareness of mental health, career and social/emotional development; short-term counseling interventions; and referrals to community resources for long-term support. Additionally, teachers will all participate in Attitude is Altitude (AiA) with their students.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The school implements a comprehensive system of tiered academic and behavioral supports to enable students' mastery of grade-level expectations. The following programs will be used to support our students PBIS, CHAMPS, and Live School. The following would be implemented.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

The student support team will customize practices to support student behavior, such as defining and teaching appropriate behavior.

Systems of support for school educators include school-wide behavioral expectations, indicators, and coaching.

Data-based decision-making is the cornerstone of the behavior problem-solving process.

Professional Development will consist of hands-on activities that address ways to have effective and engaging small-group instruction. PD will also allow teachers to pull data to use for differentiated instruction.

North Broward Academy of Excellence has the initiative to improve school community culture to retain effective teachers. This will be done through parent and family community events, teachers incentives, and staff participation at school and sports events.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A