

Broward County Public Schools

# Dave Thomas Education Center West



## 2019-20 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Dave Thomas Education Center West

4690 COCONUT CREEK PKWY, Coconut Creek, FL 33063

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Synithia Crawford**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2006

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
<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>	CS&I

\* 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 Broward 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Dave Thomas Education Center West

4690 COCONUT CREEK PKWY, Coconut Creek, FL 33063

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK, 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

### School Grades History

Year	2012-13	2012-13
Grade		

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

Our mission is to provide a relevant, rigorous curriculum in a safe and conducive learning academic environment. With the help of parent(s)/ guardian(s), equip each student with lifelong skills and academic strategies that prepare them for college or careers in a global society.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to Stimulate, Motivate, Educate, Empower, and Graduate our students to become productive members of society.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lockhart-Talley, Tracy	Principal	Lead teachers and staff, set goals for the school, and work to meet the academic needs of all students. Overseeing school operations, budgets, discipline, and hiring and ensuring that each is efficiently producing positive results.
Crawford, Synithia	Assistant Principal	
Price , Kelly	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with the vision, mission, and responsibilities of Charles Drew Family Resource Center.
Rolle, Kenneth	SAC Member	Ensure Mrs. Talley's vision and mission for Dave Thomas Education Center and Charles Drew Family Resource Center is fulfilled through community, parents, students, and business partners.

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	32	72	153	416	749	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	72	78	79	81	344	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	22	43	22	11	110	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	11	7	1	22	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	100	96	85	87	451	

**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	0	0	57	72	75	60	57	321	

**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	28	3	3	3	21	58	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	41	19	14	20	111	

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

25

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

Wednesday 8/7/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
Attendance below 90 percent													
One or more suspensions													
Course failure in ELA or Math													
Level 1 on statewide assessment													

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
Students with two or more indicators													

**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		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	91	71	83	84	353	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	25	13	12	76	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	10	3	3	34	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	80	96	96	84	441	

**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	0	0	43	55	60	50	52	260	



## 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	0%	58%	61%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	58%	62%	0%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	52%	0%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	51%	56%	0%	46%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	74%	78%	0%	71%	75%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	76 (0)	32 (0)	72 (0)	153 (0)	416 (0)	749 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	0 ( )	34 ( )	72 ( )	78 ( )	79 ( )	81 ( )	344 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (0)	22 (0)	43 (0)	22 (0)	11 (0)	110 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	11 (0)	7 (0)	1 (0)	22 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	83 (0)	100 (0)	96 (0)	85 (0)	87 (0)	451 (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.

NOTE: 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
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	10%	59%	-49%	56%	-46%
	2018	16%	60%	-44%	58%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	0%	57%	-57%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
10	2019	4%	53%	-49%	53%	-49%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	6%	45%	-39%	46%	-40%
	2018	1%	47%	-46%	45%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	1%	43%	-42%	48%	-47%
	2018	5%	45%	-40%	50%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	10%	67%	-57%	67%	-57%
2018	7%	62%	-55%	65%	-58%
Compare		3%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	15%	67%	-52%	70%	-55%
2018	20%	66%	-46%	68%	-48%
Compare		-5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	3%	61%	-58%	61%	-58%
2018	7%	63%	-56%	62%	-55%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	2%	56%	-54%	57%	-55%
2018	2%	51%	-49%	56%	-54%
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD										33	
ELL										15	
BLK								6		33	10
HSP										32	20
WHT										30	
FRL							8	9		34	9
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											
ELL											
BLK											
HSP											
WHT											
FRL											
2017 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											
ELL											
BLK											
HSP											
WHT											
FRL											

### 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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	11

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	13
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	80
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	82%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	14
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	12
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	26
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	30
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	13
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.**

African American students had the lowest performance. This subgroup is our largest population and most of these students are from low social economic communities.

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

We saw a rise in student suspensions. This is due to teachers moving from novice users to proficient users of BASIS.

**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 greatest gap was in ELA and Math. The majority of students come to our school below proficiency level and as a result greater gaps exist in those 2 categories.

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

Attendance percentages declined across all grade levels with the exception of 8th and 10th grade. This is due to the school's ability to meet student needs academically, socially, and emotionally.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Suspensions is one of our areas of concern that we will focus on by implementing a school wide positive behavior plan.

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

1. Learning gains in ELA and Math
2. Graduation rate
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1**

**Title**

Overall learning gains for ELA and Math

**Rationale**

We are working to improve learning gains among all students and track their progress toward proficiency.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

By June of 2020 students will increase learning gains by 2% in ELA and math.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Tracy Lockhart-Talley (tracy.lockhart-talley@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

Implementing quarterly assessments to monitor student growth via Khan Academy, USA test prep, teacher made assessments, ACT & SAT academy.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

Students will improve their skills and knowledge of standards with the use of these identified platforms.

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. Create IFC's based on end of year baseline data
2. Implement CARE (Curriculum Assessment Remediation and Enrichment)
3. Data Chats
4. Assessment
- 5.

**Person Responsible**

Tracy Lockhart-Talley (tracy.lockhart-talley@browardschools.com)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

N/A