Florida A&M University Developmental Research School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Florida A&M University Developmental Research School

400 W ORANGE AVE, Tallahassee, FL 32307

www.famudrs.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.

The mission of Florida A&M University's Developmental Research School (FAMU DRS) is to conduct research, demonstration, and evaluation of the management of teaching and learning. FAMU DRS will place curriculum emphasis on mathematics, science, technology, and foreign languages. FAMU DRS is committed to providing a quality education for students by promoting rigor and innovative strategies for teaching and learning.

In addition to providing other instruction in non-specialized courses, the DRS will foster educational opportunities that encourage each student to develop personal responsibility, respect for individual differences, and an inquiring mind so that each student will continue to learn, develop and apply skills to become a productive citizen in an ever-changing society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University Developmental Research School is to prepare and motivate our students for a rapidly evolving digital world by instilling in them critical thinking skills, a global mindset, and a respect for core values. Students will prepare today to succeed for tomorrow.

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
Johnson, Micheal	Superintendent	To ensure the SIP is implemented district-wide.

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.

There are several stakeholder groups who work together to play a role in developing the SIP.

District and School Administration: The district and school administration helped to plan and promote a streamlined, inclusive SIP process through parent/student, faculty/staff, and community stakeholder meetings and focus groups.

Community Stakeholders: Our active Parent Teacher Association (PTA), School Advisory Council, (SAC), School Board, alumnus, and University stakeholders advocate for the best interests of the students, faculty, and school as a whole. Through monthly and quarterly meetings, community stakeholders, particularly the SAC, meet to develop strategies and goals for the SIP and overall school improvement.

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))

We will utilize the SAC and leadership team to systematically monitor the SIP and revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. The SAC will meet monthly to to review SIP strategies and goals and recommend systems of improvement as necessary.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	100%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: I 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	4	24	11	6	10	7	15	17	13	107
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	0	3	2	7	7	8	34
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	0	5	1	0	6	0	1	15
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	2	5	2	5	3	6	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	5	6	10	10	18	19	10	17	14	109
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	26	7	10	17	12	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	4	15	20	27	34	19	37	28	190
	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	2	1	5	18	7	15	6	21	14	89

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	6	8	13	7	12	8	10	11	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	8
Course failure in ELA	2	1	3	0	1	5	0	3	6	22
Course failure in Math	1	0	2	0	2	4	5	7	4	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	5	17	2	16	10	102
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	14	18	8	36	13	158
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	4	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	1	5	18	7	15	6	21	14	131

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	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	6	8	13	7	12	8	10	11	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4
Course failure in ELA	2	1	3	0	1	5	0	3	6	21
Course failure in Math	1	0	2	0	2	4	5	7	4	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	5	17	2	16	10	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	14	18	8	36	13	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	4	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	1	5	18	7	15	6	21	14	89

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37	37	53	41	41	55	34		
ELA Learning Gains				53			29		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			22		
Math Achievement*	27	27	55	27	51	42	18		
Math Learning Gains				50			11		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			8		
Science Achievement*	36	36	52	32	27	54	19		
Social Studies Achievement*	46	46	68	57	50	59	49		
Middle School Acceleration	15	15	70	35	56	51	33		
Graduation Rate	95	95	74	98	32	50	100		
College and Career Acceleration	33	33	53	43	57	70	23		
ELP Progress				55		35	70		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	98

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	0	Yes	4	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	29	Yes	2	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	42			

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	3	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	32	Yes	1	

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				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	45			

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	37			27			36	46	15	95	33	
SWD	0			0							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			26			37	46	12	36	8	
HSP	26			32							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	37			27			36	46	15	33	8	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	41	53	51	27	50	56	32	57	35	98	43	
SWD	6	19	30	7	55							
ELL												
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	41	54	53	27	51	57	31	57	36	98	43	
HSP	36	42		20	31							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	41	53	51	27	50	56	32	57	35			

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	34	29	22	18	11	8	19	49	33	100	23	
SWD	19	17		0	0	0						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	28	23	18	11	8	19	51	32	100	23	
HSP	23	30		18								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34	29	22	18	11	8	19	49	33	100	25	

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	46%	46%	0%	50%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	28%	28%	0%	54%	-26%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	34%	34%	0%	47%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	43%	0%	47%	-4%
09	2023 - Spring	31%	31%	0%	48%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	23%	23%	0%	58%	-35%
06	2023 - Spring	51%	51%	0%	47%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	43%	0%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	36%	36%	0%	54%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	37%	37%	0%	48%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	60%	0%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	9%	9%	0%	61%	-52%
08	2023 - Spring	26%	26%	0%	55%	-29%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	57%	0%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	29%	0%	44%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	37%	0%	51%	-14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	22%	0%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	20%	20%	0%	48%	-28%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	63%	-19%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	45%	0%	66%	-21%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	63%	-14%

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.

Based on our Spring 2023 (FAST PM III) our lowest performance was in math. The selection pool of hiring certified math teachers was difficult. Majority of our math instructors last year were out-of-field.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2022-2023 was math achievement. The main contributing factor to the decline in mathematics achievement was the high percentage of math instructors being out of field last school year due to challenges with recruitment and retention of highly qualified math teachers.

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.

Math data shows we had the greatest gap compared to the state average. There was a high percentage of math instructors out of field last school year due to challenges with recruitment and retention of highly qualified math teachers that significantly impacted instruction.

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

The most improvement was shown in science achievement. There was an increase in the percentage of students performing at Level 3 or above, by 12%.

New actions in this area included implementation of science labs, hands-on learning activities, guest speakers who were experts in the field of science, and mobile science labs that visited the campus. There was also an increase in science field trips that provided students with more exposure to science in action.

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

Level I students in Math (FAST PM III)
Student Attendance

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

Math Performance
Students with Disablities
ELL Students (Hispanics)
Student Attendance
Teacer Attendance

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.

Based on our Spring 2023 test scores, our students with disabilities scored below 41%.

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

Students with disabiltiies will meet the threshold of at least 41% in both reading and math on the Spring 2024 state assessments.

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

Classroom Assessments from SAVAAS curriculum/units.
SuccessMaker for Reading and Math (SAVASS)
Professional Learning Communities, DATA Chat and APM II Data
FAST PM I and FAST PM II
Continous Improvement Meetings with District Personnel

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Micheal Johnson (micheal.johnson@famu.edu)

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

SuccessMaker Reading and Math
Mindplay
Ascend Math
Small-group Instruction

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

Successmaker, Mindplay, and Ascend Math are instructional and adaptative software which is designed to meet each student needs.

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 Hispanic

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

Based on our Spring 2023 state assessment scores our ELL students scored below 41%.

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

At least 41% of our ELL students will score at least a Level 3 or above on both reading and math Spring 2024 state assessments.

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

Classroom AssessmentsSAVASS Curriculum (Math and Reading) English and Spanish Version
ESOL assistance
Professional Learning Communities, DATA Chats
Continuous Improvement Meetings with District Personnel

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Micheal Johnson (micheal.johnson@famu.edu)

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

SuccessMaker (Reading and Math)

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

SuccessMaker provides adaptive and personalized instruction to students whose first language is not English. Students can receive support and intervention in literacy and math to improve their understanding and application of the English language.

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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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.

Teachers will be in attendance at least 90% of the school year.

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

Teacher Attendance
FAST APM I and FAST AMP II
Principal Meetings data chats

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Genleah Swain (genleah.swain@famu.edu)

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

Teacher of the Month (Recognition)
Accentives (Giftcards, Comp-Time)

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

Research says adults like to be praised and recognized for doing well. Recognition also serves as motivation.

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 SAC, working with school leadership, during their regular meetings and scheduled focus groups, will monitor and systematically review allocated SIP funding and resources to ensure that school activities and programs are properly identified and supported based upon needs and overall school initiatives.

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

The area of focus for grades K-2 Reading/ELA is foundational skills. Based on end of the year K-2 FAST data more than 50% of students scored below a level 3. In addition, the progress monitoring data for K-2 students during the 2021-2022 school year indicated that students struggled with decoding and fluency as a result of their primary years being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The students subsequently missed the majority of foundational skills instruction needed to be successful readers. The students will receive explicit and systematic instruction in the foundational skills to improve their decoding and encoding skills in reading. Data from the FAST (PM 1-3) in conjunction with the SAVVAS Reading program formative assessments will be disaggregated and analyzed to plan and deliver the instructional needs of grades K-2 in Reading/ELA.

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

The area of focus for 3-5 Reading/ELA will be to provide instruction in the comprehension component of the reading process with emphases on analyzing and interpreting complex text. Based on end of the year 3-5 FAST data more than 50% of students scored below a level 3. Based on the 2021 -2022 FSA ELA data analysis of the identified areas of focus indicated that the 3rd-5th grade students performed lowest in the area of literary text. The students will receive instruction which will include FLDOE Practice Profile instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded instruction, differentiated instruction, corrective feedback). The Practice Profile Practices will provide rigorous and structured learning opportunities for students to comprehend complex text in order to excel when reading literary text.

Data from the FAST (PM 1-3) in conjunction with the SAVVAS Reading program formative assessments will be disaggregated and analyzed to plan and deliver the instructional needs of grades 3-5 in Reading/ELA.

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

According to 2021-2022 FSA end-of-the-year data, reading proficiency was as follows:
Grade KG – 50% proficiency
Grade 1 – 40% proficiency
Grade 2 – 37% proficiency

The following represents results of the 2022 -2023 FAST PM 3:
Grade KG –51% proficiency
Grade 1 –75% proficiency
Grade 2 –43% proficiency

The following is the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve on the final FAST 2023-2024 assessment:
Grade KG – 55% proficiency
Grade 1 – 75%proficiency
Grade 2 – 50% proficiency

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to 2021-2022 FSA end-of-the-year data, reading proficiency was as follows:
Grade 3 – 42% proficiency
Grade 4 – 26% proficiency
Grade 5 – 50% proficiency

According to 2022-2023 FAST PM3 end-of-the-year data, reading proficiency was as follows:
Grade 3 – 42% proficiency
Grade 4 – 23% proficiency
Grade 5 – 26% proficiency

The following is the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve on the final FAST PM3 2023-2024 assessment:
Grade 3 – 50% proficiency
Grade 4 – 40% proficiency
Grade 5 – 40% proficiency

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.

The areas of focus will be monitored for desired outcomes through instructional walkthroughs and observations, as well as bi-weekly data chats with teachers to determine progress of students and instructional strategies implemented to continuously increase achievement. Monitoring will be continual and systematic with feedback provided based on progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Swain, Genleah, genleah.swain@famu.edu

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?

Explicit and systematic literacy and vocabulary instruction, the facilitation of collaborative discussion and learning through complex questioning, exposure to varied texts, and small group intensive instruction will be implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes. These practices will be monitored by instructional walkthroughs and observations conducted by the school principal. Evidence-based instructional software programs will also be implemented (Pearson SuccesMaker and MindPlay) to remediate reading deficiencies by providing students with individualized instructional pathways. These programs will be monitored by the school principal by reviewing software usage data and student levels within the programs.

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?

These practices and programs meet the definition of evidence-based, they align with the 2023-2024 Comprehensive Reading Plan and align with B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

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
Professional Learning: Teachers will receive initial and ongoing (monthly) professional development in explicit literacy instruction. Teachers will also participate in professional learning communities. Teachers will receive more training on explicit, multi-sensory, and systematic instruction will be provided to teachers. Professional Learning: Teacher will participate in additional training on instructional software to enhance their fidelity of use of the programs in their classrooms facilitated by Savvas reading company. The school will ensure fidelity of usage with instructional software programs: Mindplay, Lexia and Pearson Successmaker.	Swain, Genleah, genleah.swain@famu.edu
Literacy Coaching: The literacy coach will observe teacher lessons, provide feedback, and model lessons based on the level of teacher efficacy in explicit instruction. Literacy Coaching: The literacy coach will provide support to teachers on implementation of programs within classrooms and also how to read and utilize data from the programs to inform instruction.	Swain, Genleah, genleah.swain@famu.edu
Assessment: Teachers will assess students weekly using the SAVVAS reading curriculum. Students will participate in the FAST progress monitoring. Data will be analyzed to determine effectiveness and growth in foundational skills. Assessment: Students will participate in monthly diagnostics within the instructional software programs. Data will be analyzed to determine student the level of academic growth of each student as well as current instructional needs.	Swain, Genleah, genleah.swain@famu.edu
Literacy Leadership: The principal will also conduct literacy walks with the curriculum coordinator to determine the level of effective implementation of explicit instruction and provide teachers with relevant feedback. Expectations will be clearly communicated as well as professional support and resources will be provided to teachers to ensure fidelity of instruction. Literacy Leadership: The school principal will review and analyze weekly usage reports for both instructional software programs to determine the level of fidelity of use within classrooms. Teachers will be provided with expected usage minutes, as well as scheduled time for work on instructional software programs.	Swain, Genleah, genleah.swain@famu.edu

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.

This SIP will be posted on the school's website (www.famudrs.org), as well as will be shared in the school's School Advisory Council meeting which includes all stakeholders.

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))

Several stakeholder groups work together to promote positive, 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. FAMU DRS' Title I Office implements several family engagement initiatives throughout the year.

District and School Administration: The district and school administration promote a positive culture and environment through their open-door policies and the establishment of positive, appropriate policies.

Faculty, and Staff: Teachers, faculty, and staff throughout the campus play a vital role in promoting a positive culture and environment at FAMU DRS through their support of and respect for our students, their colleagues, and community partners and supporters.

Students: Students play a vital role in promoting a positive culture and environment at FAMU DRS by adhering to school rules and policies, displaying appropriate behavior, engaging in academic and extracurricular activities, supporting each other and demonstrating collegiality, being responsible, and being their best selves.

Parents/Guardians: Parents play a vital role in promoting a positive culture and environment at FAMU DRS by supporting students, teachers, and administration in the adherence to school rules and policies, volunteering, supporting, and engaging in academic and extracurricular programs and activities, and advocating for students and the school.

Community Stakeholders: Our active Parent Teacher Association (PTA), School Advisory Council (SAC), School Board, alumnus, and University stakeholders advocate for the best interests of the students, faculty, and school as a whole. Through advocacy, volunteerism, policy review and contributions, financial contributions, and academic and CCR expansion and exposure opportunities, our community stakeholders play a vital role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school through their support, encouragement, and advocacy.

FAMU DRS website: www.famudrs.org

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))

The academic program in the school will be strengthened by monitoring the implementation of new research-based curriculum to ensure fidelity within classrooms. The academic program is also strengthened by increasing the number of teachers who are highly qualified to teach in specific content areas.

The school plans to improve the quality of learning time in the following ways:

-Increase professional learning communities (PLCs) in which teachers are provided with opportunities to collaborate and learn more about effective instructional strategies that increase achievement and meet the needs of all learners.
-Implement coaching cycles that include school principals & coaches conducting walkthroughs and feedback conversations about observed learning time and instructional pedagogy.
-Decrease school activities that interrupt the learning day and increase protection of instructional time

The school plans to increase the amount of learning time in the following ways:

-Continue implementation of the Beyond the Bell tutoring afterschool tutoring program for 10 weeks each school semester
-Increase elective courses that emphasize cross-curricular instruction of content areas (i.e., performing arts:literacy skills; Music:math, etc.)

The school plans to provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum through implementation of the following programs:

-SuccessMaker in conjunction with SAVVAS Literacy and Math core curricula
-Implementation of a newly articulated agreement with TCC, FAMU, and Lively Tech for dual enrollment for high performing students.
-Literacy and Math Schoolwide Initiatives that will challenge and motivate students to become active participants in literacy and math learning.
-Aleks Math (6-12) supplemental instructional program which is an adaptive math program that will help fill in learning gaps, but also challeng students performing at a higher level
-B.E.S.T. ELA and Math implementation with fidelity

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))

This plan is developed in coordination and integration with our academic departments, various community stakeholders (Parent Teacher Association, School Advisory Council, School Board), our Title I program, our ESOL/ELL program, our District Career and Technical Education Department, our School Social Work Department, the McKinney-Vento program, our Student Support Services Department, and our Food Services Department. Each program/entity provided input, advocacy, insight, guidance, and assistance in the development of this plan.

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))

The school provides counseling to students at the request of teachers and parents or students who are self-advocating for themselves. The school also has mental health services and resources that are offered to students or parents and families by a mental health specialist. Resources that are offered include resources that are provided externally within the community.

Guidance counselors also provide trainings and learning sessions to classes of students on various topics as outlined in state statutes.

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))

The FAMU DRS Future Center was started in 2022 to provide high school students with resources and preparation for postsecondary education, opportunites, and the workforce. Students have access to materials and assistance for college applications, workforce opportunities, CTE programs, and information about how to earn college credits during their high school tenure.

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 schoolwide tiered model for behavior through the Response to Intervention process. Positive behavior intervention supports are utilized with increasing intensity (multi-tiered systems of supports (MTSS)):

Tier I: Classroom management plans, incentives, school counseling
Tier II: Parent conferences, individual student behavior contracts that include supports and plans for behavior modifications
Tier III: Functinal Behavior Assessments (FBA), Behaior Intervention Plan (BIP), referral for evaluation with outside agency or school psychologist.etc.

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))

A professional learning plan is created and implemented at the district level to ensure the provision of high quality professional learning opportunities for teachers. Professional Learning Communities are also implemented to enhance teacher pedagogy and self-efficacy. PLCs are facilitated by department chairs and school leaders and emphasize data analysis for data-driven instruction, as well as analysis of the most effective teaching strategies that will yield the highest level of results. A new and beginning teacher program is also implemented which provides teachers with the preparation and support needed to effectively enter classrooms for the first time. The PLCs and Beginning Teachers' program are both ways in which to recruit and retain teachers by providing support for them to be successful educators.

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$136,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	3374-Supplemental Academics	519-Technology-Related Supplemental	0351 - Florida A&M University Developmental Research	IDEA		$7,000.00
			Notes: MindPlay Literacy/Reading Intervention Technology Program			
	3374-Supplemental Academics	519-Technology-Related Supplemental	0351 - Florida A&M University Developmental Research	IDEA		$4,000.00
			Notes: Ascend Math Intervention Technology Program			
	5200	120	0351 - Florida A&M University Developmental Research	IDEA	1.0	$65,000.00
			Notes: Classroom Teacher ESE Faculty (1.0 FTE) will provide service to students with Individual Education Plans to include classroom strategies and instruction.			
	5200	130	0351 - Florida A&M University Developmental Research	IDEA	0.5	$30,000.00
			Notes: Certified instructional personnel. Certified speech and language pathologist for DRS students with speech and language identifiers in the ESE program.			
	5200	130	0351 - Florida A&M University Developmental Research	IDEA	0.5	$30,000.00
			Notes: Certified instructional personnel. Certified school psychologist for DRS students with appropriate identifiers in the ESE program.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic				$51,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6100	130	0351 - Florida A&M University Developmental Research	Title, I Part A	1.0	$50,000.00
			Notes: Instructional personnel. Dual language specialist for DRS students identified for the ESOL/ELL program.			
	6100	590	0351 - Florida A&M University Developmental Research	General Fund		$1,500.00
			Notes: Testing materials and supplies, including WIDA, for identified students in ESOL/ELL program.			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance				$30,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24

	6400	290	0351 - Florida A&M University Developmental Research	Title II		$30,000.00
			Notes: Teacher Stipends to create positive culture and environment, including teacher attendance			
					Total:	**$217,500.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes