

Florida Atlantic University - College of Education

# A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>31</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (88%) 2017-18: A (86%) 2016-17: A (87%) 2015-16: A (84%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	[not available]

\* 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](http://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	Other	Principal/Director	Principal/Director
Rick, Christine	Assistant Principal		High School Assistant Principal
Hoff, Cornelia	Assistant Principal		K-8 Assistant Principal
Hallstrom, Kimberly	Other	Assistant Director	Assistant Director- Student Services, Instruction, and Technology Integration
Hufty, Gina	Reading Coach		K-5 Reading and Instructional Facilitator
Robinson, Lauren	Assistant Principal		Assistant Principal of K-5
Diaz, Gracie	Other	Deputy Superintendent	Deputy Superintendent
Fisher, Keith	Assistant Principal		Assistant Principal of Operations and Facilities

### 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

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,298

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

9

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

8

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

**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	59	61	59	60	70	71	80	81	82	148	172	175	175	1293
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	7	4	9	7	7	5	7	6	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	3	1	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	9

**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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 9/27/2021

**2020-21 - 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	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	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	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	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	1	2	0	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	0

**2020-21 - 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	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	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	1
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	91%			93%	83%	61%	90%	80%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	77%			81%	74%	59%	81%	75%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%			75%	66%	54%	75%	66%	52%
Math Achievement	86%			92%	84%	62%	89%	84%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%			76%	70%	59%	74%	74%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%			76%	62%	52%	71%	67%	52%
Science Achievement	87%			88%	76%	56%	91%	79%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	93%			99%	94%	78%	96%	91%	77%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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	2021					
	2019	91%	77%	14%	58%	33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	89%	79%	10%	58%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2021					
	2019	85%	71%	14%	56%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
06	2021					
	2019	89%	74%	15%	54%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
07	2021					
	2019	85%	76%	9%	52%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
08	2021					
	2019	89%	84%	5%	56%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
09	2021					
	2019	100%	100%	0%	55%	45%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
10	2021					
	2019	100%	100%	0%	53%	47%
Cohort Comparison		-100%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	92%	79%	13%	62%	30%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	74%	11%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				
05	2021					
	2019	92%	67%	25%	60%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
06	2021					
	2019	94%	90%	4%	55%	39%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				
07	2021					
	2019	87%	79%	8%	54%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-94%				
08	2021					
	2019	97%	66%	31%	46%	51%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	84%	64%	20%	53%	31%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	74%	73%	1%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	100%	0%	67%	33%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	91%	8%	71%	28%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	0%	0%	70%	-70%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	94%	-2%	61%	31%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	100%	0%	57%	43%

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

STAR Reading (Renaissance Learning): grades 1-5

STAR Math (Renaissance Learning): grades 1-5

iReady Diagnostic, Reading and Math: grades 3-5

ALEKS, Math: grades 3-8

USA Test Prep, ELA: grades 6-8, and Science: grades 5 & 8

Performance Matters diagnostic data base, Civics: grade 7

<b>Grade 1</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	80%	92%	92%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	50%	50%	50%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	89%	87%	98%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
<b>Grade 2</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	79%	89%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	60%	70%	70%
	English Language Learners	50%	75%	75%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78%	87%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	80%	80%	90%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82%	87%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	69%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	50%
	English Language Learners	40%	60%	60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	85%	87%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55%	59%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	50%	25%
	English Language Learners	20%	0%	40%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	80%	90%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%	62%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	25%	14%
	English Language Learners	100%	75%	57%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70%	82%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59%	64%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	25%	0%
	English Language Learners	43%	50%	25%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82%	84%	90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%	56%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	29%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75%	84%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	62%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	30%
	English Language Learners	50%	84%	84%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	55%	67%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	56%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	40%	40%
	English Language Learners	0%	100%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43%	61%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	53%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	44%	44%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47%	59%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	77%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	25%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65%	69%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57%	65%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	0	40%	60%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60%	60%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	92%	77%	84%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	100%	50%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	62%	82%	90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41%	57%	77%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	44%	66%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64%	67%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%	62%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	44%	17%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40%	80%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	50%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	33%	50%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	52%	66%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	42%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	0	44%	66%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	97%		94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%		98%
	Students With Disabilities	100%		100%
	English Language Learners	N/A		N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			



Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

**Subgroup Data Review**

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	28	31	26	34	41	38	21				
ELL	77	85	100	81	40						
ASN	98	89	94	91	57		95			100	100
BLK	81	62	60	69	45	44	76	90	73	100	100
HSP	94	83	85	88	62	64	87	100	71	100	100

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	90	76		89	67		85				
WHT	92	76	73	90	59	67	90	88	82	100	100
FRL	83	70	70	78	48	52	71	88	74	100	100
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	907
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	77
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	73
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	85
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	81
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	83
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	76
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The virtual environment, due to the pandemic, impaired hands-on learning and engagement. This was particularly evident with students in some subgroups. Nationally, mathematics achievement fell by greater percentage than reading/language arts. Results within the subgroups (e.g. economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities) fared far worse. Researchers posit that remote learning, disrupted school schedules, health or family-related stress, and/or social isolation may be contributing factors. Math instruction typically requires a hands-on approach to learning, particularly in the early grades. Overall, schoolwide mathematics achievement on the 2021 assessments showed the largest drop, 5 percentage points. However, consistent with national reporting, there were more significant drops within the subgroups. For example, when compared to 2019 results, Black/African American students scoring level 3 or above fell 25.7 percentage points, students with disabilities fell 25.8 and economically disadvantaged students fell 11.4 percentage points. Schoolwide math learning gains, when compared to 2019, also showed a decline of 17 percentage points.

While English/Language Arts FSA results were stronger than math, students in ELA subgroups also experienced some declines. For example, SWDs who scored a level 3 or above dropped 19.7 percentage points; Black/African American students scoring level 3 and above fell 6.7 percentage points, and economically disadvantaged students fell 5.9 percentage points.

The virtual environment also impacted science achievement. Student proficiency in grade 5 and grade 8 fell 5 and 2 percentage points, respectively.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Using results from the 2021 Assessments, learning gains in math, math achievement within subgroups, and science proficiency demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

The virtual environment, due to the pandemic, impaired hands-on learning and engagement. In order to address the areas in need of improvement, the following actions have been put into place: Increased hands-on labs, in-class and during after-school tutoring. Additional software purchases that provide virtual science labs offer an alternative for out-of-class learning experiences. Extended learning/after school tutoring in September (rather than January, as in previous years). Implemented the Henderson Scholars/HS partnership program. Continued partnership with College of Medicine (science inquiry).

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Using progress monitoring data and 2021 assessment results, students in Grade 5 and Grade 8 improved their proficiency in ELA by 3 and 1 percentage points, respectively. Although there were declines in proficiency in some areas, schoolwide science proficiency fell by only 1 percentage point from the 2019 assessment.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

In ELA, assessment results were most consistent with course performance (virtual learning/ELA expectations). Many teachers used technology to supplement reading/ELA instruction before the pandemic. This required less of a shift to a hybrid or fully online environment. In order to address the limited hands-on learning experiences in science classrooms due to the pandemic, the school executed a monthly STEM-at-home project in which kits with science materials were mailed to students for at-home learning.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Early implementation of after school tutoring  
Close monitoring of data to inform instruction  
Timely and targeted in-school interventions  
Quarterly data chats

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Classroom walk-throughs and feedback cycles  
Extensive Wilson Foundations training for K-3 teachers, with a focus on phonological awareness, phonic instruction, and interventions  
Instructional leader participation in the B.E.S.T. Standards professional development for ELA and math offered by the FDOE  
Quarterly data chats to analyze data from progress monitoring assessments, identify gaps in instruction and student learning, identify students in need of extra support or intervention  
PLCs focus on curriculum and instruction, evaluate standards indicating the least proficiency, and suggest effective strategies to use in classrooms to help assist with mastery of those standards

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Utilize CARES Act funding (ESSER II) to implement tutoring and other support early and often.  
Create a plan for sustainability of implementation when the funding source expires.  
Determine struggling students early in the school year through formative assessment data and

analysis along with whole-team quarterly data chats and provide those students with interventions during and after school as necessary.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Schoolwide 2020-2021 science achievement decreased 1 percentage point to 87% from the previous assessment (88% in 18-19), although 100% of the students who took the Biology end-of-course exam were proficient. Student proficiency on the NGSSS in grade 5 (79%) and grade 8 (72%) decreased by 5 and 2 percentage points respectively. The virtual environment due to the pandemic impaired hands-on learning and engagement.

**Measureable Outcome:** Eighty eight (88%) percent of students will earn a passing score (3 or higher) in science as indicated by the end-of-year, schoolwide science assessments.

**Monitoring:** Bi-weekly benchmark assessments and mid-year diagnostics will provide on-going progress monitoring of students’ understanding of the standards and to provide targeted instruction. Utilizing USA Test Prep results as a progress monitoring tool, instructors will identify any student who may be at risk of not meeting the grade level standards and help to identify students in need of additional support or intervention.

School administrators and team leaders will monitor progress on the implementation of strategies and assessments through classroom walkthroughs, data chats, and grade level and team meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sherry Bees (sbees@fau.edu)

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.

**Evidence-based Strategy:** In addition, the grade 6-8 science teachers will administer a teacher-created benchmark assessment, using results to modify the curriculum scope and sequence to address potential gaps. The grade 8 science teacher will use diagnostic assessments to develop a pacing guide to ensure all science standards are 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.

Elementary instructors use STEMscopes and Inspire Science (McGraw Hill) text to address grade level standards along with classroom teacher-directed labs. 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). Providing students with a test simulation experience may improve the students’ familiarity with the tested material, increase self-efficacy with test taking, and reduce anxiety (Snooks, 2004).

**Action Steps to Implement**

Analyze 8th grade students' grade 5 NGSSS data along with fall diagnostics to identify gaps in foundational skills and content knowledge. Use ongoing progress monitoring data to assess student learning

**Person Responsible** Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

Identify students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on the FSA reading and math and/or scored below the 50th percentile on the Science diagnostic and provide after school support and tutoring.

**Person Responsible** Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

Lead quarterly data meetings with teachers to review student progress and identify students in need of academic intervention.

**Person Responsible** Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

Expand collaboration between the K-5 teachers and the Science-through-Art teacher for the development of lessons in which the students apply scientific understanding during hands-on activities during their art elective.

**Person Responsible** Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

Create professional learning communities that focus on research-based strategies and review instructional effectiveness based on student data.

**Person Responsible** Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Overall, 77% of students made learning gains in English Language Arts, which represents a decrease of 4% from the 18-19 statewide testing. The virtual environment due to the pandemic impaired hands-on learning and engagement.

**Measureable Outcome:** At least 84% of students will make learning gains as indicated on the 2021-2022 FSA in English Language Arts.

**Monitoring:** School administrators and team leaders will monitor progress on the implementation of strategies and assessments through classroom walkthroughs, data chats, and grade level and team meetings. The school's comprehensive evidence-based reading plan (CERP) decision tree will guide the instruction, progress monitoring, and intervention process.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sherry Bees (sbees@fau.edu)

Utilize designated daily iii (WIN) time for ELA interventions and ongoing progress monitoring through MTSS. Middle school teachers will use USA Test Prep, Common Lit, and IXL for progress monitoring.

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Elementary teachers will use iReady, STAR Reading, and IXL to monitor progress. Kindergarten through third grade teachers will use Wilson's Foundations for Tier 1 phonics instruction, with a more intensive intervention model implemented for students who require Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions. Teachers will receive extensive and ongoing professional learning and coaching on the use of Foundations beginning in July of 2021 and throughout the school year.

**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). Many studies support the use of an explicit, systematic, and multisensory approach to instruction in phonological awareness and phonics, see two IES meta-analyses that support this claim here and here. In addition to the research cited, these essential skills are highlighted in Florida's new ELA B.E.S.T. Standards as part of the cornerstones of reading.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Utilize multiple data points for progress monitoring from USA Test Prep, Common Lit, No Red Ink, and IXL in the Middle School, and STAR Reading, iReady, and IXL in the elementary grades. Continue WIN Data meetings and intervention cycles for students performing below grade level.

**Person Responsible:** Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

Provide multiple professional learning opportunities in reading strategies through coaching and training to include Wilson Foundations Implementation (Wilson Facilitator Training, K-3 teacher professional development, on-going classroom walkthroughs and coaching, and Foundations Intervention Training).

**Person Responsible:** Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

Focus Middle School PLCs on supporting the ELA, Math, and Science standards that indicate the lowest proficiency. Teachers in each PLC group will identify the standards with the lowest proficiency and identify effective strategies to use in classrooms to help assist with mastery of those standards.

**Person Responsible** Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

Use data chats to identify students in K-5 not meeting grade level standards and provide interventions for those students not meeting grade level expectations.

**Person Responsible** Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

Use data chats to identify students in grades 6-8 not meeting grade level standards and provide interventions for those students not meeting grade level expectations.

**Person Responsible** Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

Implement after school tutoring and support in Middle School for students who have been identified as struggling with ELA standards.

**Person Responsible** Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Schoolwide data show 58% of the students made learning gains in mathematics on the 20-21 statewide assessments, a decrease of 18% from the 18-19 statewide assessments. The virtual environment due to the pandemic impaired hands-on learning and engagement.

**Measureable Outcome:** At least 77% of students will make learning gains in mathematics as indicated by the 2021-2022 combined mathematics assessments (FSA and EOCs).

**Monitoring:** Utilizing quarterly data chats, school administrators and team leaders will monitor progress on the implementation of strategies and assessments based on classroom walkthroughs, data analysis, and grade level and team meeting feedback.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sherry Bees (sbees@fau.edu)

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

Teachers in K-8 will use progress monitoring data from IXL to identify standards for reteaching, and to monitor students' grade level progress. Students who are identified as struggling to meet grade level expectations may be provided in-class assistance, interventions, and after-school tutoring.

**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

Utilize IXL (K-5), iReady (K-5), Zearn (K-5), and STAR Math (K-3) for progress monitoring to inform instruction during daily kindergarten through fifth grade WIN time; and use quarterly data chats to identify students not meeting grade level standards.

**Person Responsible:** Lauren Robinson (lrobin15@fau.edu)

Utilize ALEKS (6-8) and IXL (K-8) for progress monitoring and to inform instruction. Use quarterly data chats to identify students not meeting grade level standards.

**Person Responsible:** Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

Teach mini lessons and/or conference in small groups with students in grades K-8 to reflect daily lesson data through exit tickets/ and other formative assessments. (Hoff and Robinson)

**Person Responsible:** Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

Provide tutoring and/or classroom interventions for students not meeting grade level standards/ expectations. (Hoff and Robinson)

**Person Responsible:** Cornelia Hoff (choff1@fau.edu)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

#### 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.

Many schoolwide activities embrace a positive school culture. Staff, student, and PTO led activities encourage school-wide involvement, for example the Sunshine Club, spirit days, Community Newsletters, Backpack Program for Title I students (in partnership with Boca Helping Hands), Wounded Warrior project.

The school's counseling team leads several inclusive activities. Among them are Coffee Talks, which are parent workshops that inform families on a variety of topics that address the three ASCA Student Standards Domains (Social-Emotional, Academic, Career), Unity Day annual event occurring during National Bullying Prevention Month in October that promotes joining together to create healthier communities through kindness, acceptance, and inclusion, monthly counselor newsletters inform the school community about school-wide events, skills, and strategies to help maintain a positive school culture, and Start With Hello Week, an age-appropriate training that raises awareness and educates students about social isolation and how to create a connected and inclusive classroom, school, and community.

In addition, the team has focused on students' social and emotional health by initiating the use of universal screeners for early identification of students who may be at-risk or in need of intervention beyond Tier 1 and shifts the focus from reactive to proactive.

#### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Parents, guardians, and caregivers provide input on curriculum, health and safety, accessibility, and extracurricular activities through annual surveys, PTO meetings, SAB meetings, and the monthly community newsletter that include embedded links for follow up questions. Teachers and school staff provide input on curriculum, professional development needs, health and safety through the annual Survey of Needs, quarterly data chats, and monthly grade level meetings. The school's administration leads teacher effectiveness through a cycle of observation and feedback, monitors student achievement using progress monitoring assessment scores, and manages budgeted allocations to ensure student success.

Finally, the School Advisory Body provides input on school policies, procedures, and equitability through monthly meetings and subcommittees.

<b>Part V: Budget</b>						
<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>				<b>\$17,001.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$1,558.00
			<i>Notes: Software for test prep and progress monitoring: USA Test Prep</i>			
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	General Fund		\$7,267.00
			<i>Notes: Software and instructional supplies to support instruction in STEM-related concepts: STEMScopes and Inspire Science</i>			
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Title IV		\$3,250.00
			<i>Notes: Software to support instruction in STEM-related concepts: CoderZ</i>			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	General Fund		\$4,926.00
			<i>Notes: ESSER II funding to provide stipends to teachers for tutoring students after school.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$37,374.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Title II		\$1,212.00
			<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		\$14,888.00
			<i>Notes: Use reading allocation for software and instructional supplies to provide progress monitoring data and intervention resources in ELA in K-8: iReady, Renaissance Learning, Wilson Foundations</i>			
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	General Fund		\$8,760.00
			<i>Notes: ESSER II funding for progress monitoring software: USA Test Prep and IXL</i>			
			0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$7,588.00
			<i>Notes: Using ESSER II funding, purchase additional instructional materials (Wilson Foundations)</i>			

		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$4,926.00
			<i>Notes: Use ESSER II funding to provide stipends to teachers for afterschool tutoring and interventions in ELA.</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$35,527.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$20,889.00
			<i>Notes: ESSER II funds for software for math instruction and progress monitoring Mathematics software (ALEKS) that supports achievement, acceleration, and progress monitoring for students in grades 3-8 and IXL (together with ELA) for K-8 progress monitoring.</i>			
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	General Fund		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Zearn mathematics software that supports achievement and progress monitoring for students in grades K-5</i>			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Title II		\$1,212.00
			<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>			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$6,000.00
			<i>Notes: The Javits grant is used for middle grade students Honors Scholars 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>			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0011 - A.D. Henderson University School & FAU High	Other Federal		\$4,926.00
			<i>Notes: Use ESSER II funding to provide stipends to teachers for afterschool tutoring and interventions in math.</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$89,902.00</b>