

Broward County Public Schools

West Broward Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

West Broward Academy

5281 COCONUT CREEK PKWY, Margate, FL 33063

www.westbrowardacademy.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 West Broward Academy is to engage students and promote high achievement with a well-rounded elementary and middle school education, through a challenging program, focused on mathematics and science using innovative, reform-based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our school vision is to create a community where all students feel loved, respected, and encouraged 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
Hugue , Derrick	Principal	The principal is the academic leader of the school. Their main focus is to develop and maintain effective educational programs within the school and to promote the improvement of teaching and learning. The principal should strive to create a climate which fosters teacher and student growth.
Padron, Rossana	Assistant Principal	Assistant principals support the principal in all aspects of student achievement and discipline. They also support schoolwide academic goals and support teachers in achieving excellence.

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.

The SIP was created in conjunction with the school leadership team, Charter School Associates, and the Governing Board, Advantage Academy of Broward, INC

SIP Monitoring

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

The leadership team will actively monitor student data to increase instructional strategies and student achievement. The team will meet monthly to review the SIP and enact any necessary changes to promote student achievement.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	15
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3	15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	18	10	22	17	19	86
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	17	31	21	11	101
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	24	15	20	12	13	14	8	9	124

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	1	1	0	2	18	14	20	16	18	90

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	2	4	0	7	0	0	1	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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*	47	55	53	49	57	55	40		
ELA Learning Gains				63			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			41		
Math Achievement*	41	52	55	42	47	42	29		
Math Learning Gains				55			16		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			23		
Science Achievement*	35	50	52	27	52	54	14		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	68	68	81	64	59	66		
Middle School Acceleration	88	72	70	45	57	51	32		
Graduation Rate		68	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		66	70			
ELP Progress	50	53	55	55	75	70	63		

* 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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52

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	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	19	Yes	2	2
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	48			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	51			

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	23	Yes	1	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	52			

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	51			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	51			

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	47			41			35	68	88			50
SWD	18			30			8				3	
ELL	30			36			17	58			6	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			41			40	55	100		6	
HSP	46			40			27	74	70		7	42
MUL	53			27							2	
PAC												
WHT	68			59							2	
FRL	47			40			34	63	94		7	55

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	49	63	53	42	55	49	27	81	45			55
SWD	21	34	29	9	31	31	8					
ELL	32	55	48	35	59	48	14	82				55
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	48	60	53	40	56	54	24	84				
HSP	47	64	48	45	56	46	30	76	50			59
MUL	53	69		29	54							
PAC												
WHT	68	74		48	53							
FRL	48	62	46	43	57	52	26	80	43			55

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	40	42	41	29	16	23	14	66	32			63
SWD	17	39	43	11	17	14	0					
ELL	31	54	55	14	16	24	7	55				63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	39	32	24	15	21	15	54	33			
HSP	40	48	55	33	20	29	11	83				62
MUL	43	20		29	0							
PAC												
WHT	59	50		34	11							
FRL	38	41	41	24	15	17	12	65	26			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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	56%	-1%	54%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	49%	-1%	47%	1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	49%	1%	47%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	47%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	32%	53%	-21%	50%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	54%	-17%	54%	-17%
07	2023 - Spring	39%	51%	-12%	48%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	62%	-11%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	65%	-14%	61%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	46%	1%	55%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	58%	-22%	55%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	3%	38%	-35%	44%	-41%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	46%	-10%	51%	-15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	48%	17%	50%	15%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	63%	25%	63%	25%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	64%	4%	66%	2%

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.

Our 22-23 ESE data shows that Grade 7 ELA students were the lowest performing group. We had zero out of six students scoring at a level 3 or higher.

Some of the contributing factors include reading comprehension and vocabulary deficiencies. 50% of ESE students in grade 7 were reading at a fifth grade reading level according to the Spring 22-23 DAR-Diagnostic Reading Assessment administration. Based on FAST PM1 23-24 data, the same cohort of students who are now in eighth grade have all scored at a level 1.

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

Fourth grade showed the greatest decline when comparing FAST ELA PM3 data from Spring 2022 to Spring 2023.

Fourth grade ELA proficiency scores dropped from 62% to 38% proficiency. Factors that contributed to this decline include

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.

Grade 8 Science had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. West Broward Academy had 3% of eight graders scoring at a level 3 or higher. This is forty-one percentage points less than the state proficiency scores. Some of the contributing factors include a lack of critical grade 6 and 7 science standard foundations.

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

The area component that showed the most improvement was Algebra. Spring EOC Algebra 2023 data showed that 8th grade students scored 65% proficiency, which is thirty-six percentage points greater than the prior year, Spring 2022. Some of the new actions included more professional development for our math teachers in the areas of differentiated instruction and student engagement for middle school students in addition to Saturday ELO or tutoring opportunities, having more technology available for our students to utilize online resources from SAVVAS and Khan Academy.

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

The areas of concern include the number of students who scored at a Level 1 in Reading and Math in grades 4-7

as well as the number of students with Substantial reading deficiencies in third grade.

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

ESE subgroups in all grade levels

Grade 4

Grade 6

Grade 5

Grade 7

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 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.

Parents play an integral role in the education of their children as partners with the school. Each parent is encouraged to volunteer 10 hours per family per year. Opportunities to volunteer include evening projects, chaperoning of evening activities or other opportunities developed by the school’s staff. Parent University sessions include topics such as: Utilizing math resources, Reading with Your Child and Asking Thought Provoking Questions about the Passage, Specific ELL and ESE strategies, Hispanic Heritage Night, etc. This approach assists in developing that critical partnership between the school and parents to help their children achieve, and for parents to support educational practice at home. The ESE Specialist and ELL staff will ensure that parents of those students receive information regarding these programs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, increase parental involvement and attendance by 5 percentage points from the previous school year at the events included in our Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

Monitoring:

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

The school will keep attendance of these events and ensure effective communication of events in a timely manner.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Derrick Hugue (charter5052@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

N/A

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.

Provide at a minimum one week notice via PowerSchool and e-mails inviting parents to attend our school events.

Person Responsible: Derrick Hugue (charter5052@browardschools.com)

By When: June 2024

#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.

According to the 21-22 FSA data, our ESE students obtained 23% of the total Federal Index. Additionally, the 22-23 ELA PM3 data shows that two grade levels had zero ESE students scoring at a level 3 or higher. These students are now in grades 5 and 8. Therefore, our ESE population is an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, a minimum of 50% of our ESE subgroup will score levels 3 or higher in the ELA and Math PM3 FAST assessments.

Monitoring:

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

FAST data, supplemental program data, and exam data will be triangulated to target BEST standards to drive standards-based instructional decisions. On-going progress monitoring will also occur through the review of Literacy Design Collaborative writing samples, curriculum assessments, and benchmarks. Specific strategies to remediate learning deficiencies will be implemented. Supplemental materials include, but are not limited to: Success Maker, IXL, Magnetic Reading, Ready Florida Math, MyOn, Easy CBM, and ILit45

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rossana Padron (rpadron@charterk12.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.)

All Pacing Guides and Focus Calendars align with the BEST Standards to guide instruction. Savvas core curriculum for math, reading, and science will be utilized to meet the rigorous requirements of the BEST standards. All classes will provide appropriate interventions based on student's academic needs and data supporting the interventions. Supplemental curriculum that is researched-based will be used in small group to address the learning gaps. Daily intervention may be required for those students consistently demonstrating non-mastery and previously identified as Tier 2 or Tier 3. Reading strategies in other content areas will be provided in addition to those taught during reading and language arts classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Savvas core curriculum is utilized as part of the school's instructional plan. The program has supplemental materials designed to remediate skills. PM1, PM2, and PM3 is implemented for all benchmark testing in all grade levels to monitor standards mastery on a quarterly basis. The assessments are used to provide data to make instructional decisions based on the needs of each grade level and classroom to focus on the strengths and needs of individual students. The data is utilized in data meetings with administrators, teachers, coaches, and students on a regular basis to create and modify goals to improve student achievement levels.

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.

Academic intervention groups will include ESE students addressing reading and math deficiencies.

Person Responsible: Derrick Hugue (charter5052@browardschools.com)

By When: June 2024

ESE teacher will be equipped with the appropriate resources and curriculum to deliver reading and math lessons when pulling ESE students for services.

Person Responsible: Rossana Padron (rpadron@charterk12.com)

By When: June 2024

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

School Improvement funding allocations and resources based on needs are discussed and decided on by all stakeholders. Funds are allocated to provide supplemental research-based materials to meet the needs of student subgroups.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the 22-23 and PM1 23-24 STAR data, 50% or more students in grades K-2 are on track to score a Level 3 or above in the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. This data, combined with data collected from EasyCBM progress monitoring assessments identifies specific gaps in foundational skills that will be addressed through the use of core curriculum support resources found in myView, explicit and systematic instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Grade 3:

The primary area of focus for third grade will be foundational reading skills to improve oral reading fluency and comprehension. Teachers will use the Reading Routine Companions from myView to address these focus areas in conjunction with on-level daily instruction. myFocus Readers and myFocus Interventions will be used for small group and individualized instruction to address specific student needs. These deficits in foundational skills are directly affecting reading comprehension.

Grades 4 and 5:

The area of focus for students in grades 4 and 5 is reading comprehension. Instructional practices include anchor charts, graphic organizers, differentiated instruction groups, and grouping Tier 2 and 3 students according to their intervention goals established after analyzing their reading baseline

assessments such as FAST and BAS reading running records for students scoring at a level 1 or 2. Principles of universal design for learning as defined in 34 C.F.R. 200.2(b)(2)(ii) are routinely incorporated into instruction using our core, intervention, and supplemental curricula. High yield teacher led instructional practices and strategies such as reciprocal teaching, repeated, reading, and teacher modeling are used during teacher lessons in K-8.

Students in grades 3-5 identified as having substantial reading deficiencies will receive explicit phonics and fluency instruction to improve their reading skills. Additionally, classroom teachers will receive professional development on utilizing effective ESOL strategies and differentiated instruction targeting the varied reading level groups.

Students with reading deficiencies in grades 3-5 were identified through F.A.S.T. performance and weekly unit assessment data points. Additionally, WBA utilized B.A.S. to further identify current reading levels and deficits in oral reading fluency and comprehension.

ELA FAST- Percent of students achieving levels 3 or higher

PM3 22-23 PM1 23-24

Grade 3: 32% 16%

Grade 4: 38% 27%

Grade 5: 55% 25%

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Students in grades K-2 are on track to pass the statewide assessment.

As of 2022-23:

Kindergarten scored a 67% proficiency in the ELA FAST PM3 2022-23.

First grade students scored a 59% proficiency in the ELA FAST PM3 2022-23.

Second grade students scored a 66% proficiency in the ELA FAST PM3 2022-23.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grade 3: 60% of students in grade 3 will achieve a level 3 or higher on the 2024 PM3 F.A.S.T.

Grade 4: 58% of students in grade 3 will achieve a level 3 or higher on the 2024 PM3 F.A.S.T.

Grade 5: 55% of students in grade 3 will achieve a level 3 or higher on the 2024 PM3 F.A.S.T.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency will all be monitored through the disaggregation of weekly progress checkups and unit assessments that identify these specific reading elements. Based on student performance, adjustments to small group and individualized interventions will be made as discussed during recurring PLCs that include teachers, coaches, and administration. Students will also be provided with explicit task-centric feedback through student-teacher data chats following assessments. Teachers will use formative assessment data to make real-time instructional decisions based on student needs in real-time and use this information to adjust and differentiate instruction. Administration will monitor the implementation of these practices through classroom observations regularly.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hugue , Derrick, charter5052@browardschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Savvas Learning Company myView (K-5); State adopted, strong evidence in Ed Reports.

Magnetic Reading used a supplemental small group material (yearlong or based on progress monitoring data).

This curriculum offers state of the art reading instruction based specifically on the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards. Utilizing a comprehensive standards-aligned literacy workshop model (reading and writing) and multi-genre texts, students are explicitly taught foundational skills to support reading comprehension and are provided with rich and purposeful materials and practices to build reading, writing, speaking, and listening achievement. In the higher grades there is intentional integration of reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language skills instruction and collaborative activities to prepare students for success in college and career.

Tiers 2 and 3 evidence-based programs:

-Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) resources (yearlong or based on progress monitoring data)

-myFocusReader (yearlong and/or based on progress monitoring data)

-Ready Toolbox: Tools for Instruction

All of the resources mentioned above are in alignment with the school's CERP and FL BEST Standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All instructional and intervention resources are standards-aligned, address gaps and reduce barriers to students' ability to meet Tier 1 expectations, provide systematic, explicit, and interactive small group instruction targeting foundational skills and comprehension deficits, are matched to the needs of the students, provide multiple opportunities to practice the targeted skill(s) and receive corrective feedback. Principles of universal design for learning as defined in 34 C.F.R. 200.2(b)(2)(ii) are routinely incorporated into instruction using our core, intervention, and supplemental curricula. Problem-solving teams ensure continuity and relevance of Tier 2 and 3 instruction. High yield research-based instructional practices and strategies such as reciprocal teaching, repeated, reading, and teacher modeling are used during teacher lessons in K-8.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>1-identification and planning for multisensory practice implementation in reading classrooms.</p> <p>Literacy Leadership: The leadership team, in conjunction with grade level teams, the literacy coach, and ESE and ESOL personnel will work as a Problem-Solving Leadership Team. This team will work to identify core areas of focus for professional development.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching: Literacy coach will develop a deeper understating of the use of multisensory practices in the reading classroom. This understanding will focus both on the pedagogical and andragogical support research and best practices for implementation.</p> <p>Assessment: Administration and coaches will establish a schedule for the monitoring of the fidelity of implementation to assess the greatest areas of need.</p> <p>Professional Learning: Professional development sessions will be scheduled and provided to teachers.</p>	<p>Hugue , Derrick, charter5052@browardschools.com</p>
<p>2- initial roll-out of multisensory initiative</p> <p>Literacy Leadership: Literacy Leadership team will serve as champions for the initiative, providing support and enthusiasm for the focus.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching: Literacy coach will provide initial professional development focused on the science and strategies for implanting multisensory learning experience. This will focus on the “why” as well as the “how” in terms of planning and resources.</p> <p>Assessment: Teachers will be asked to complete an exit survey to share their satisfaction with the professional development and provide an opportunity for feedback and request for additional support.</p> <p>Professional Learning: Professional development session will include a presentation for some key points but will be primarily delivered through the use of multisensory practices to illustrate the effectiveness of these practices. Literacy coach will also provide model lessons and co-teaching opportunities to all reading teachers.</p>	<p>Padron, Rossana, rpadron@charterk12.com</p>
<p>3 – Continued monitoring and support for the use of multisensory practices in all reading classrooms.</p> <p>Literacy Leadership: Ongoing monitoring and support of the use of multisensory practices in each K-5 Reading classroom.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching: Ongoing monitoring and support of the use of multisensory practices in each K-5 Reading classroom.</p>	<p>Hugue , Derrick, charter5052@browardschools.com</p>

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Assessment: Teachers will be assessed on their implementation of multisensory practices through the observed student use of multisensory practices, performance on progress monitoring assessments, and lesson plan monitoring for the intentional implementation of these practices.</p> <p>Professional Learning: Ongoing (fall, winter, spring) refresher professional development on the use and impact of multisensory practices in the reading classroom.</p>	

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.

A notification regarding the availability and location of the Schoolwide Plan and the School Parent and Family Engagement will be provided via e-mail to the staff and families in multiple languages. The schoolwide plan is located in our school website. Additionally, a binder containing copies of the schoolwide plan and PFEP will be located at the front office for families to review.
<https://www.westbrowardacademy.com/families/title-i>

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))

West Broward Academy will engage parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner, in the planning, review, and improvement of programs in this part, including the planning, review, and improvement of the school parent and family engagement policy and the joint development of the schoolwide program plan.
During the annual Title I Parent Meeting-August of each school year parents are provided with detailed information about the Title I program, Title I’s role at West Broward Academy, funding provided to parent engagement and student advancement, WBA’s school grade, standardized testing process, & state testing research resources.
Zoom-In with the Principal-Once a month, all parents are invited to a meeting with the school administrators to discuss school-wide improvement and important events taking place during the school year. During these meetings, parents are given an opportunity to be a part of the decision-making process.

School Advisory Committees-parents are invited to attend the school advisory committees, and they can give their input at these meetings.

Website:

<https://www.westbrowardacademy.com/families/title-i>

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)

All assessment tools mentioned in the needs assessment portion of the School-Wide Plan were used to get student baseline data. This data along with the previously FAST Assessed school year data provide a foundation for teachers and administrators. Students who have academic deficiencies also receive after school tutoring twice a week and receive small group interventions according to their needs including ESE students. All students that received a 1 or 2 on the previously scored FAST, are required to have a teacher-parent created progress monitoring plan for the 23-24 school year.

Additionally, advanced level students are given opportunities to do project-based learning. To Track the performance of students, all students participate in the statewide FAST progress monitoring assessments which are given three times per year. These assessments are aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards and give detailed reports of students' individual progress. Teachers and administrators use this data to tailor instruction that meets the needs of all students.

All teachers utilize Marzano's 9 instructional strategies for teaching and learning. These strategies are research based. Administrators visit the classrooms daily to ensure that Marzano 's instructional strategies are implemented with fidelity. All observations are recorded using the Observe for Success tool. After each observation, teachers are automatically emailed feedback for the administrators to help teachers strengthen their pedagogy. All teachers participate in monthly professional development that is based on their needs and the students' needs. Teachers receive professional development on providing research-based interventions for students who do not master the standards.

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))

N/A