

Broward County Public Schools

Franklin Academy Pembroke Pines High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Franklin Academy Pembroke Pines High School

5000 SW 207TH TERRACE, Pembroke Pines, FL 33332

www.franklin-academy.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.

Utilizing an intercultural-mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasizes character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Utilizing an intercultural-mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasizes character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

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
Showalter, Diane	Principal	Oversee the SIP implementation and monitoring its progress.
Capozzoli, Jenny	Other	ESE Oversight, Compliance for IEPs, student collaboration and consults, ESE teacher schedules

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.

All stakeholders were involved in adding input to the development of the SIP. A meeting was held to go over why Franklin was identified for a SIP. The data was disaggregated and in a roundtable discussion a needs assessment was conducted. The focus of the conversation was identifying the why SWD were performing below performance level, identifying the potential causes, and possible actionable goals to meet by the end of the school year.

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))

After each state assessment progress monitoring period, the collection and analyzation of the student data is done to monitor for progress. Interim assessment tools are used for progress monitoring prior to state assessment benchmarks. These progress monitoring checks are essential to ensure that the action steps detailed in the SIP are working effectively towards student achievement gains. Based on the results of these ongoing checks, the team will decide if instructional changes must be made prior to state assessment benchmarks. A key element to achieving success involves conducting data chats and curriculum meetings where our general education teachers and ESE facilitators collaborate to discuss student-specific data. These meetings result in the creation of tailored action plans that best address the individual needs of each student. Formal data chats will take place after each progress monitoring assessment, facilitating an ongoing, detailed review of student progress. Additionally, informal data chats will be conducted during department meetings to ensure continuous monitoring of student advancement. By taking these comprehensive measures, we aim to significantly improve the academic status of our SWD subgroup and ensure that all students achieve their full potential. The goal is to ensure that positive progress is evident.

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 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	87%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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	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*	48	50	50	56	52	51	56		
ELA Learning Gains				58			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			46		
Math Achievement*	37	36	38	35	41	38	29		
Math Learning Gains				44			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			29		
Science Achievement*	66	60	64	62	35	40	51		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	66	66	71	51	48	67		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	86	90	89	96	54	61	98		
College and Career Acceleration	41	61	65	45	66	67	39		
ELP Progress	55	50	45	60			72		

** 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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	86

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	96

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	36	Yes	4	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	55			
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			

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	56			

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	39	Yes	3	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	60			
BLK	56			
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	59			

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	48			37			66	71		86	41	55
SWD	25			16			46	50		0	6	
ELL	25			29			63	58		53	7	55
AMI												
ASN	75									30	3	
BLK	51			29			67	68		26	6	
HSP	46			41			69	68		51	7	51
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	45			25			54	88		32	6	
FRL	48			39			75	64		35	7	48

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	56	58	52	35	44	51	62	71		96	45	60
SWD	23	62	56	15	42	50	26	38		75	0	
ELL	39	57	48	29	35	48	52	38		94	62	60
AMI												
ASN	68	58		62	50							
BLK	52	60	64	33	36		59	70		98	32	
HSP	55	57	48	33	45	50	62	69		94	51	64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	66	56	55	39	55		67	78		100	50	
FRL	53	62		57	50					95	39	

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	56	46	29	23	29	51	67		98	39	72
SWD	22	27	21	18	21	33	44	56		100	0	
ELL	34	59	56	24	27	26	37	57		94	50	72
AMI												
ASN	61	71										
BLK	55	49	33	16	25	35	50	67		95	33	
HSP	52	57	49	30	23	25	52	59		98	47	72
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	61	50	42	25		51	90		100	30	
FRL	53	53	46	27	22	26	49	59		96	32	67

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	50%	49%	1%	50%	0%
09	2023 - Spring	46%	49%	-3%	48%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	37%	48%	-11%	50%	-13%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	48%	-7%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	63%	1%	63%	1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	62%	7%	63%	6%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our overall ELA Achievement within our students with disabilities, at 23%. Compared to our general ed population who scored a 56% overall in ELA Achievement.

The contributing factors for this data are the transition of a full year back on campus from virtual teaching, students coming in below grade level, and lack of data driven instruction to support student achievement and growth; i.e. teachers utilizing tier 1 best practices such as differentiated instruction as it relates to specific student learning outcomes for our students with an IEP.

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

The School did not show a decline, but the overall ELA Achievement for students with disabilities continued to be performing below the 41% Federal index level with a 23%, compared to the previous year at 22%.

The contributing factors for continuously performing below the 41% index are: teacher turnover during the 21-22 school year, large influx of ESE students to the campus, and teachers new to the profession who have limited knowledge on implementing accommodations through the tier 1 instruction.

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.

Franklin Academy did not have a gap when compared to the state. Our overall ELA Achievement scored was 56% and the state scored 52%. In ELA, Learning Gains we scored 58% and compared to the state at 52%. In ELA, our Lowest 25% scored 52% and compared to the state is 41%. Our SAT data, showed that our 11th and 12th graders are scoring below the mean total score when comparing to the state.

Within the section performance, 29% of our 11th and 12th graders met both benchmark performance, but scored below when compared to the states at 32%.

The contributing factors were a shift towards an attempt at differentiation during tier 1 instruction, a focus on comprehensive lesson planning with standards based instruction.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement within the area of students with disabilities were within ELA Learning Gains, 62%, compared to the previous year is 27% and ELA Lowest 25th% with a 56%, compared to the previous year at 21%. Both showed a 35% growth within our lowest performing group of students.

The contributing factor was that students returned on campus for instruction after the pandemic, allowing teachers and support facilitators to provide appropriate services to students and accommodations in person directly related to goals and learning outcomes outlined on the IEP. ESE departments were able to make changes to IEPs from temporary distance learning plans to original plans to adding services and accommodations. This was a critical exercise in determining any new goals that were presented in students with disabilities, as their needs changed due to remote learning and a lack of direct contact services.

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

N/A

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

Supporting our students with disabilities
Tier 1 differentiated Instruction
Implement the MTSS process with fidelity

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 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 continued to perform below the 41% index level for 3 consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of PM3, 50% of students with disabilities within ELA achievement will make one achievement level gain on the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The ESE team will participate in bi-weekly curriculum meetings with grade level and department team meetings. During these meetings, current data for all students will be examined and monitored for progress. The ESE team will have to conduct their own department meeting to check in on individual student progress. The ESE team will participate in ongoing data chats with grade level and departments to ensure students at risk are being supported.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.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.)

Students with disabilities will have the opportunity to receive remediation through Progress Learning; an instructional software program that provides remediation lessons for grade level standards for lowest performing standards. Students will be provided with small group instruction to close the achievement gap within tier 1 instruction with our HMH ELA resource. Ongoing data chats will be implemented based on progress monitoring data checks. ESE students will be provided with a learning strategies class to their schedule to ensure that they are working on independent functioning skills that will support core classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen intervention will help provide remediation in a small group setting to assist with tier 1 instruction and be able to meet the needs of our students with disabilities. Data chats are an integral part of monitoring for student growth and ensuring that the support provided is effective. Placing our ESE students in a learning strategy class will increase the effectiveness of their independent functioning skills to support their academic growth.

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.

Remediation through Progress Learning
Differentiated small group instruction
Continue with Data Chats
Implement learning strategies class in the current schedule

Person Responsible: Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.org)

By When: Ongoing through June 2024.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**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.

Overall achievement levels and learning gains to ensure we earn a grade level A on the school report card.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of PM3, the scores of the FAST assessments will amount to a 3-5 point increase in school grade level to achieve a rating of A.

Monitoring:

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

During department meetings, teachers work collaboratively to implement their curriculum map. The map supports sequencing of the standards and the pacing of instruction. Teachers go over standards to determine what the students need to know, understand, and do. Teachers begin with a backwards planning approach, defining the success criterion for mastering the standards and then developing an assessment to measure the learning and planning a sequence of lessons that aligns to the end result. Teachers decide which instructional strategies support their lesson delivery to have a higher impact. Specific tasks are developed as formative assessments to allow opportunities for mastery. Student subgroups are discussed to ensure appropriate accommodations are provided. Classroom data is discussed, so that decisions are being made about specific students and how to best support them. Administrative team will conduct lesson plan checks to ensure standards based instruction, student accommodations and goals are listed for each SWD.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.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.)

The school is focused on implementing tier 1 instruction and implementing instructional strategies, in class interventions, and using appropriate resources to help all students achieve. The multi-tiered model's goal is a prevention framework used to maximize student success by providing support to students at risk. All teachers will plan for differentiated small group instruction using research-based and standard aligned instructional resources based on formative and benchmark assessment results. Students who are performing below grade level will be placed through the RTI program and be provided interventions that align to their skill deficit. Teachers will evaluate the effectiveness of their tier 1 formative assessments. Instructional support will be provided to teachers through the coaching cycle.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen intervention will help teachers plan for effective small group differentiated instruction through their collaborative department planning meetings with the support of their admin and curriculum specialist to ensure the plan aligns with student data. Implementing the RTI process will help provide students who are in need of interventions to receive remediation in their area of need. Reviewing formative assessments will guarantee that assessments align to the depth and rigor of the B.E.S.T. standards. Instructional coaching will be provided to teachers who are in need of support to increase the effectiveness of their classroom instruction and impact student achievement.

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.

- Differentiated Small group instruction
- Begin RTI process and provide students with interventions
- Evaluate formative assessments
- Implement coaching cycles

Person Responsible: Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.org)

By When: Ongoing through June 2024.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The School demonstrated the lowest performance in ELA Achievement within our students with disabilities, with a 23%. General ed population scored a 56% in ELA Achievement. In order for continuous improvement we must provide ongoing support for all students and teachers to increase student achievement. All stakeholders play a part in supporting our students' growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of PM3, SWD subgroup will achieve the target 41% or higher per the Federal Percent Points Index for performance on the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The School will monitor student classroom and benchmark data in bi-weekly curriculum meetings as well as state assessment data to ensure that plans are being implemented and monitored for success. The ESE team will be part of the curriculum meetings to assess ESE student progress. The guidance department will have ongoing meetings to ensure students are being assisted in their academic plans for graduation requirements and future endeavors. Parents meetings are held to ensure they are involved in their students' academic plans to provide that additional support at home.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.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.)

Professional development will be provided to all teachers to improve capacity in providing accommodation in the classroom and student support. Additional teacher development will be provided and ongoing to improve instructional delivery practices, student engagement, designing assessments, and evaluating results.

Teachers will continue to implement differentiated instruction in the classroom to support all students. Teachers use their classroom data and place students in groups based on student performance data. Teachers are encouraged to implement station rotation model, so all students have the opportunity to receive differentiated support and be able to master their area of need.

All students have an advisory period where important topics for students well-being and developmental are discussed in a collaborative way.

All students are exposed to many post-high school education and career options through on-campus visits, field trips, and other learning opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All stakeholders, teachers, staff, students and families, play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school. Teachers and staff will be supportive of the student in following their roles of maintaining a safe and positive learning environment. Family roles include participating in schoolwide events, and communication with teachers and staff. The intervention plan was written to ensure students receive suitable support in school to ensure academic growth and achievement.

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.

Differentiated Small group instruction.

Curriculum meetings to ensure proper pacing of curriculum and data chats.

Teacher professional development for continued growth. .

Guidance meetings to ensure graduation requirement for all students.

Person Responsible: Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.org)

By When: Ongoing through June 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School funds determination is based on student needs. Having been identified as a ATSI school, we will use any additional funding to support our MTSS intervention program. Allocating for additional instructional support for would have a positive impact on student achievement. The current programs we use are HMH for Tier 1, Read 180 for Tier 2 and System 44 for Tier 3 for our reading interventions. Additionally we use supplemental program in our tier 1 instruction such as, Progress Learning to remediate within tier 1. Progress Learning uses student data to remediate any standard that the student has not mastered. All of these programs are crucial to ensure that students are receiving support from the programs to make the necessary student achievement gains.