

Florida Atlantic University - College of Education

A.D. Henderson University School & FAU



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High School

777 GLADES RD BLDG 26, Boca Raton, FL 33431

www.adhus.fau.edu

Demographics

Principal: Sherry Bees

Start Date for this Principal: 7/5/2016

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	33%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (88%) 2017-18: A (86%) 2016-17: A (87%) 2015-16: A (84%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FAU Lab Sch County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

A.D. Henderson University School and FAU High School endeavors to: (1) demonstrate best practices in teacher education; (2) innovate, develop, and provide students with a challenging curriculum, balanced with innovative academic support; and (3) conduct and support emerging educational research.

Provide the school's vision statement

The Alexander D. Henderson University School/FAU High School (ADHUS/FAUHS) is a national exemplary model for school systems and teacher preparation programs improving education for diverse student populations through innovative, faculty-developed research and curriculum.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bees, Sherry	Principal	
Hallstrom, Kimberly	Other	
Robinson, Lauren	Administrative Support	
Diaz, Gracie	Administrative Support	
Hoff, Cornelia	Assistant Principal	
Rick, Christine	Assistant Principal	
Hufty, Gina	Instructional Coach	
Phipps, Allan	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/5/2016, Sherry Bees

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	33%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (88%) 2017-18: A (86%) 2016-17: A (87%) 2015-16: A (84%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	60	61	60	70	73	77	81	76	155	166	179	152	1271
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	1	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	2	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 11/10/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	54	54	58	60	71	72	80	80	75	152	153	156	140	1205
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	2	3	3	1	5	5	7	1	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	54	54	58	60	71	72	80	80	75	152	153	156	140	1205
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	2	3	3	1	5	5	7	1	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	93%	83%	61%	90%	80%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	81%	74%	59%	81%	75%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	75%	66%	54%	75%	66%	52%
Math Achievement	92%	84%	62%	89%	84%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	70%	59%	74%	74%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	62%	52%	71%	67%	52%
Science Achievement	88%	76%	56%	91%	79%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	99%	94%	78%	96%	91%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	91%	77%	14%	58%	33%
	2018	74%	73%	1%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	79%	10%	58%	31%
	2018	83%	69%	14%	56%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
05	2019	85%	71%	14%	56%	29%
	2018	86%	73%	13%	55%	31%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	89%	74%	15%	54%	35%
	2018	83%	69%	14%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
07	2019	85%	76%	9%	52%	33%
	2018	85%	79%	6%	51%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	89%	84%	5%	56%	33%
	2018	93%	86%	7%	58%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
09	2019	100%	100%	0%	55%	45%
	2018	99%	99%	0%	53%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
10	2019	100%	100%	0%	53%	47%
	2018	100%	100%	0%	53%	47%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	92%	79%	13%	62%	30%
	2018	79%	81%	-2%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	74%	11%	64%	21%
	2018	92%	73%	19%	62%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	92%	67%	25%	60%	32%
	2018	92%	79%	13%	61%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	94%	90%	4%	55%	39%
	2018	75%	83%	-8%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2019	87%	79%	8%	54%	33%
	2018	87%	83%	4%	54%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	97%	66%	31%	46%	51%
	2018	87%	70%	17%	45%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	84%	64%	20%	53%	31%
	2018	86%	69%	17%	55%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	74%	73%	1%	48%	26%
	2018	82%	75%	7%	50%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	100%	0%	67%	33%
2018	100%	100%	0%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	91%	8%	71%	28%
2018	96%	89%	7%	71%	25%
Compare		3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	0%	0%	70%	-70%
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	94%	-2%	61%	31%
2018	93%	94%	-1%	62%	31%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	100%	0%	57%	43%
2018	100%	100%	0%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	47	70	63	56	68	64	64				
ELL	79	65	30	80	75						
ASN	100	96	100	100	78		95			100	100
BLK	89	88	82	88	67	78	75	100	90	100	100
HSP	94	78	71	91	73	70	92	100	89	100	100
MUL	85	83		86	78		100				
WHT	93	77	68	94	80	79	86	96	88	100	100
FRL	89	79	71	88	72	73	77	100	88	100	100

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	48	62	56	50	63	61	31				
ELL	71	92		64	90						
ASN	98	90	92	100	67		100			100	100
BLK	87	79	89	74	68	58	74		87	100	100
HSP	90	77	66	87	75	74	85	94	83	100	100
MUL	89	82	67	82	71		100				
WHT	91	80	73	94	76	81	96	95	83	100	100
FRL	88	79	77	82	73	72	85	97	84	100	100

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	88
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	970
Total Components for the Federal Index	11

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	96
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	87
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	87
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	86
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	87
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	85
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Using school-wide data from SY18-19, science achievement had the lowest performance with 88% scoring level 3 or above. After thorough analysis of the science data and curricula, the contributing factors to the decline in science scores provide an opportunity for greater integration of science concepts within other content areas. Additionally, there are opportunities to strengthen vertical alignment to deepen the understanding of 6th and 7th grade Next Generation Science Standards within the 8th grade science courses.

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

School-wide science showed the lowest performance and the largest decline from the previous year. The decline was due to the drop in scores in grades 5 and 8.

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

The data show that the school outperforms the state in all areas. However, due to the low number of students with disabilities, the achievement gap in math and in ELA between students with disabilities (SWD) and their non-disabled peers was greater than the state average. This is partly due to the effect of the sample size; SWDs are 5% of the total population.

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

Overall, ELA, math, and social studies improved by 3 percentage points each. Math learning gains for students in the lowest quartile increased by 5%. This represents the area that shows the most improvement school-wide. There were large 1-year improvements on the math FSA in grades 4, 6, and 8 (13%, 19%, and 10%, respectively) with 4-year positive trends (2015-2019) of 9 or more points in grades 3, 5, and 8. A consistent use of the math software ALEKS in grades 3 through 9 provided formative assessment data for progress monitoring. Tutoring helped support those students who were struggling to master grade level standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

There were a total of 11 students who scored Level 1 in either math or ELA. This represents less than 3% of the affected grade levels and less than 2% of all students in tested grades (3-10). In order to address this achievement gap for future assessments, Level 1 students are placed in Tier 3 interventions according to their needs. Their progress is monitored biweekly with the intervention's assessment tool. In elementary school, STAR (Renaissance Learning) and reading running record (RRR) is given at the end of a 10 week cycle to measure overall improvement throughout the intervention period. In middle school, the reading coach or instructional interventionist works closely with the classroom teacher to assure interventions are carried out and progress is monitored.

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

1. Science proficiency
2. ELA, Learning Gains
3. Mathematics, Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Schoolwide science scores in 18-19 fell 3 percentage points from the year previous (91% in 17-18 to 88% in 18-19), although 100% of the students who took the Biology end-of-course exam were proficient. Student proficiency in grades 5 and 8 fell by 2 and 8 points respectively on the NGSSS.

Measureable Outcome: Ninety two percent of students will earn a passing score (3 or higher) in science as indicated by the end-of-year, schoolwide science assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sherry Bees (sherrybees1@gmail.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The middle school science team will disaggregate the grade 5 cohort science data to identify gaps in student mastery of the 5th grade science standards. In addition, the grade 6-8 science teachers will administer a diagnostic assessment, using results to modify the curriculum scope and sequence to address potential gaps. Grade 8 science teacher will use diagnostic assessments to develop a pacing guide to assure all science standards were taught and reviewed prior to the state assessment. Science instructional planning considers multiple intelligences and various learning modalities for active engagement and hands-on experiments that build content knowledge. Bi-weekly benchmark assessments and mid-year diagnostics provide on-going progress monitoring of students' understanding of the standards and to provide targeted instruction. Progress monitoring also helps to identify students in need of additional support or intervention. Elementary instructors use Inspire Science (McGraw Hill) text to address grade level standards, hands-on activities provided by the Cane Institute supplement the curriculum, and Gizmos software to provide digital simulations. Standards-based assessments are used to monitor progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers conduct frequent informal assessments to determine students' level of understanding of science concepts and related standards and provide targeted remediation if needed. Progress monitoring is a research-validated assessment method that provides data critical for evaluating academic performance across the entire spectrum of student achievement. (Pamela Stacker, 2010). The use of hands-on experiments and other active learning strategies improves students' ability to understand the material and make connections to their everyday life. Studies have shown Active Learning Classrooms (ALCs) help increase student engagement and improve student performance (Jung Hyun). USA Test prep will be used to improve the students' familiarity with the tested material, increase self-efficacy with test taking, and reduce anxiety (Snooks, 2004). Targeted support from a content expert provides additional remediation and monitoring.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assess student learning using USA Test Prep
2. Engage in data chats to inform teachers and administrators of students' progress toward meeting standards
3. Identify the NGSSS standards that need remediation
4. Provide additional support or interventions for students not meeting standards

Person Responsible Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Overall, 81% of students made learning gains (using 18-19 data), which was equal to the prior year. Although this represents an increase of 8 percentage points over 4 years, students did reach the 18-19 SIP goal of 84% achieving learning gains.

Measureable Outcome: At least 84% of students will make learning gains as indicated on the 2020-2021 FSA in English Language Arts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sherry Bees (sherrybees1@gmail.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize designated daily iii time for ELA interventions and ongoing progress monitoring through MTSS. Middle school teachers will use USA Test Prep for progress monitoring. Elementary will use iReady and STAR to monitor progress. The school's comprehensive evidence-based reading plan decision tree will guide the instruction, progress monitoring, and intervention process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Test preparation helps to improve the students' familiarity with the tested material, increases self-efficacy with test taking, and may reduce anxiety (Snooks, 2004). Targeted support from the reading coach/instructional specialist is provided.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize USA Test Prep for progress monitoring in the Middle School
2. Use data chats to identify students not meeting grade level standards
3. Provide interventions for students not meeting grade level expectations
4. Provide professional development in reading strategies through coaching

Person Responsible Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data from 18-19 show 75.8% of students made learning gains in math, which is an increase of 1.5 percentage points from the previous year. However, it represents a decrease of 1 percentage point over 4 years. The highest learning gain reported in the past 4 years was 81% (2017).

Measureable Outcome: At least 77% of students will make learning gains in mathematics as indicated by the 2020-2021 combined mathematics assessments (FSA and EOCs).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sherry Bees (sherrybees1@gmail.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use ALEKS - Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces, based on Knowledge Space Theory to provide an exact and comprehensive description of students' competence in math, and provides a list of topics that students are ready to learn.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By identifying students' competence with a variety of math topics, teachers are able to provide accurate interventions for students who haven't grasped grade-level concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize ALEKS for progress monitoring and informing instruction in grades 3-8 and My Math Academy in grades K-2
2. Use data chats to identify students not meeting grade level standards
3. Provide tutoring and/or classroom interventions

Person Responsible Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The Exceptional Student Education (ESE) team provides additional instruction to students as indicated on their Individual Education Plans (IEPs). In order to address learning gaps for all students, including students with disabilities, the school uses a Multiple Tiered System of Support (MTSS) through a problem-solving team approach to identify students who may not be making adequate progress. The classroom teacher, instructional interventionist, reading coach, ESE instructor, and school counselor collaborate to determine the additional services and supports that students may need.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Many schoolwide activities embrace a positive school culture including faculty and staff book studies, parent and family Coffee Talks, monthly Community Newsletters, Unity Day, Sunshine Club and more.

Parents, guardians, and caregivers provide input on curriculum, health and safety, accessibility, and extracurricular activities through annual surveys, PTO meetings, and the monthly community newsletter with embedded links for follow up questions. Teachers and school staff provide input on curriculum, professional development needs, health and safety through annual Survey of Needs, Professional Development Team meetings, and monthly grade level meetings. The school’s administration leads teacher effectiveness through a cycle of observation and feedback, monitoring student achievement, and managing budgeted allocations to ensure student success. Finally, the School Advisory Body provides input on school policies, procedures, and equitability through monthly meetings and subcommittees.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$10,735.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$939.00
			<i>Notes: ESSER funding will be used for software for test prep (USA Test Prep) and to progress monitor students' proficiency with the NGSSS.</i>			
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Title IV		\$5,736.00
			<i>Notes: Software and supplies to support instruction in STEM related concepts.</i>			
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$4,060.00

						<i>Notes: The ESSER grant funds Inspire Science software to support instruction in science concepts for students in Kindergarten through grade 5.</i>
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$20,156.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		160-Other Support Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Title II		\$1,933.00
						<i>Notes: Stipends for teachers and instructional leaders to engage in lesson-planning conferences and/or data chats to analyze and evaluate classroom lesson and unit plans to identify gaps in standards and instruction and to prepare for a cycle of feedback</i>
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$5,625.00
						<i>Notes: The ESSER grant is funding software to support instruction and progress monitoring in English/Language Arts for middle school students.</i>
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$10,098.00
						<i>Notes: The ESSER grant funds software for progress monitoring of English/ Language Arts standards and concepts in grades K through 8 (iReady, Renaissance Learning, USA Test Prep)</i>
		160-Other Support Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$2,500.00
						<i>Notes: TThe Javits grant will be used for the 8th grade Scholar Identification Program that provides support to students, particularly high-needs students, to be geared up and better prepared for the rigor of high school and for the Accuplacer.</i>
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$17,619.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$13,186.00
						<i>Notes: The ESSER grant funds mathematics software (ALEKS) that supports achievement, acceleration, and progress monitoring for students in grades 3 through 8</i>
		160-Other Support Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Title II		\$1,933.00
						<i>Notes: Stipends for teachers and instructional leaders to engage in lesson-planning conferences and/or data chats to analyze and evaluate classroom lesson and unit plans to identify gaps in standards and instruction and to prepare for a cycle of feedback</i>
		160-Other Support Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$2,500.00
						<i>Notes: The Javits grant will be used for the 8th grade Scholar Identification Program that provides support to students, particularly high-needs students, to be geared up and better prepared for the rigor of high school and for the Accuplacer assessment.</i>

	Total: \$48,510.00
--	---------------------------