Deerfield Beach High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deerfield Beach High School

910 SW 15TH ST, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jon Marlow

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2007

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&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.

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

Deerfield Beach High School

910 SW 15TH ST, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441

[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)
High School 9-12	No	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

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.

The mission of Deerfield Beach High School is to provide our students the best education in a safe and positive environment, conducive to their social, emotional, and academic growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We the administration, faculty & staff of Deerfield Beach High School, believe that educating students is teaching students how to learn. In providing students with thinking and learning skills, we enable them to become productive, self-sufficient, and responsible citizens. Deerfield Beach High School is fortunate to have students diverse in ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds. We believe that composition of our student body provides an excellent resource to teach an appreciation for differences of people within a spirit of cooperation.

We believe that education must address the "whole person", that the social, intellectual, and physical needs can not be separated. This holistic approach to education results in an integrated curriculum rich knowledge and experiences.

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
Marlow, Jon	Principal	Mr. Jon Marlow has been the principal of Deerfield Beach High School for 14 years. As the leader of the school, he supervises all Assistant Principals, Teachers, Support Personnel, and Facility Personnel. He is responsible for overall School Achievement, plans, and goals. He represents the school in the community. He provides instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school. Mr. Marlow prepares and manages the school's budget. He is responsible for the management and inventory of school's assets. He reads, interprets, follows and enforces the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and other state and federal laws. He interviews, coaches and evaluates school based personnel. He also enforces all collective bargaining agreements.
Delance, Miderland	Assistant Principal	Projected Budget, Scheduling and curriculum, Team Leader Meetings, SAC/SAF Meetings, Department Head Elections, Exam Exemption and Schedule, Interim Reports and Report Cards, Industry Certification, District and State Reports, Departmental and Textbook Orders, TDAs, Boundaries, Perkins Grant, Parent Link, Language Arts Plan, Writing Plan, Guidance Plan, ESOL Plan, ELA Scores, College Readiness Scores, Evaluations for Language Arts, ESOL and ESOL Paras, Guidance and the Budgetkeeper
Smith, Gwen	Assistant Principal	Discipline for students A-F, Free and Reduced Lunch, Grants, Black History Activities, Monthly Celebrations, Newsletter, Bucks Bulletin, PIO Programs and Responsibilities, School Marketing, Reading Plan, Reading Scores, Reading Lower Quartile, Literacy Team, Literacy Coach, Data Chats, RACC Program, CWT Meetings, Student Insurance, Accident Reports, Code of Conduct, Emergency Cards, Teacher Online Handbook, Opening Week Procedures, First Day Procedures, Media Center, Open House, NESS, Investing in Women of the Future Evaluations for: Reading, ROTC/PE/Band/Art/Drama, Vocational/Business, Media Specialist
Roberson, Keith	Assistant Principal	Discipline for students G-N, Transportation, Designee for all Security and Lockdown Procedures, Student IDs, Portable Report, Facilities and Work Orders, Custodial Supervision, Records Retention, Cafeteria/Pool, Clinic and Medication, Investigation Designee, Anti Bullying Prevention Liaison, Security and Safety, Orientations, Safety/Emergency Procedures/Drills, Keys/Parking and Lockers, Saturday Tutoring, EL0, Critical Incidence, 21st Century Grant, RISE (Internal Suspension Program), Social Studies Plan, SMART Bond, American History Scores, Evaluation for: Social Studies, Foreign Language, Security, and Custodians.
Reed, Denise	Assistant Principal	Discipline for students O-Z, Secretaries and Student Affairs, Special Events, Staff Appreciation, Graduation Plan, Science Plan, ESE Plan, Graduation Rate, Biology Scores, Detentions/Daily Schedules, RTI/Child Study, RTI Database &Plan, Discipline Plan, Discipline Committee, Testing Schedule, Testing Coordinator, PERT Testing, Student Activities: Master Calendar/Contracts/Bids/Leases/Sponsor Handbook/Pep Rallies/Assemblies/Field Trips/Guest Speakers Approvals/Daily Announcements/Marquee/Homecoming/Prom, Multicultural Activities, AP Duty Roster, Grad Bash Supervision, EEO Liaison/Sexual Health

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Initiative Grant, Attendance, Graduation, Child Study Administrator Representative -Delegates to appropriate APs, Evaluations for: Science, ESE and ESE Paras, Bookkepper, Secretaries

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728	641	581	580	2530
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	131	110	127	487
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	2	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498	453	356	268	1575
	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	84	82	0	242

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	76	58	61	240
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	12	22

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
130

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/11/2019

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	158	186	225	723
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	98	67	53	394
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	152	76	46	411
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	310	309	417	498	1534

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224	199	143	118	684

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	41%	57%	56%	47%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	52%	51%	50%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	45%	42%	37%	43%	41%
Math Achievement	32%	51%	51%	40%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	38%	44%	48%	45%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	43%	45%	41%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	54%	66%	68%	50%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	71%	73%	51%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	728 (0)	641 (0)	581 (0)	580 (0)	2530 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	119 ()	131 ()	110 ()	127 ()	487 (0)
One or more suspensions	9 (0)	6 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	17 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	498 (0)	453 (0)	356 (0)	268 (0)	1575 (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.

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
09	2019	40%	57%	-17%	55%	-15%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	53%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	38%	53%	-15%	53%	-15%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	67%	-14%	67%	-14%
2018	48%	62%	-14%	65%	-17%
Compare	5%				

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	56%	67%	-11%	70%	-14%
2018	58%	66%	-8%	68%	-10%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	61%	-36%	61%	-36%
2018	31%	63%	-32%	62%	-31%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	56%	-19%	57%	-20%
2018	37%	51%	-14%	56%	-19%
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	18	36	34	11	26	24	30	38		90	65
ELL	17	35	28	23	37	28	36	35		85	79
ASN	95	68		75	60		85				
BLK	29	39	31	23	33	23	47	50		94	81
HSP	38	39	28	35	43	43	57	65		93	90
MUL	56	50		29				73		94	100
WHT	71	59	42	59	43		71	75		95	89
FRL	33	40	33	28	36	28	51	56		93	84
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	17	22	11	15	21	13	31	35		80	77
ELL	14	38	30	20	40	36	22	24		76	72
ASN	93	54		80				100		100	100
BLK	35	44	34	27	33	33	45	50		92	85
HSP	46	50	33	40	48	42	58	63		90	87

| 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
MUL	64	73		41			55	73		72	89
WHT	66	55	22	51	38	42	68	81		90	91
FRL	41	46	32	32	39	35	51	55		89	86
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	19	33	27	23	30	32	30	33		72	59
ELL	15	37	34	26	44	42	17	9		84	48
ASN	87	83		73	62		100			93	100
BLK	36	44	36	33	43	44	45	39		87	58
HSP	51	50	36	42	40	33	49	57		89	76
MUL	50	62		39	52		55	76		92	83
WHT	67	59	44	55	53	47	60	73		95	89
FRL	41	47	36	36	44	44	46	47		88	66

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

As evidenced by the 2019 FSA, students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance in Math. A close evaluation of instruction revealed that differentiated standard based instruction is needed to address the most fundamental needs of our students and support them with meeting the rigorous Florida State Standards for Mathematics. Our students needed real life application type lessons and projects that both challenged and engaged them. Our ESE students would have also benefited from an ESE Support Facilitator with a mathematics background. Monitoring through Common Assessments and a remediation plan would have also benefited our students.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 was our Hispanic students' ELA Learning Gains. In 2018, our 50% of our Hispanic students made a learning gain. In 2019, only 39% of our students made a Learning Gain. Our careful analysis of this revealed that although our students were advancing out of the DLA Classes, strong oral language, vocabulary, and writing support was still needed in the regular Reading, English, and other content area classes. Many of the teachers struggled with providing standard based small group instruction.

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.

Algebra EOC had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. For example, from 2018 to 2019 we are 36 points behind the District and 36 points behind the State. A survey from our teachers revealed that they thought that many of our students came to high school lacking the prerequisite foundational skills to be successful in higher level math. Teachers struggled with finding a method of addressing the standards and making the standards accessible to struggling students.

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

Biology showed the most improvement. From 2018 to 2019, Biology improved by 5 percentile points. Teachers used hands on engaging activities that were both standards based and provide access to the curriculum for all demographic groups. Our Biology Department has adopted a Saturday School program that targets all Biology students. This program is highly attended as the teachers offer both grade and other incentives.

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

As we did not meet the standards for ESSA, we are concerned with our SWD students. Whereas our SWD is making strides in ELA, they are performing far below the District and State averages: ELA SWD Proficiency: 18, 9th Grade District: 57, State: 55; 10th District and Proficiency:53% . As for Math, our SWD Subgroup for Algebra and Geometry was 11% and the District and State was 61; for Geometry the District was 56% and the State was 57%. Although we did meet the ESSA standard with our Black subgroup, we are noticing some downward slides with ELA and in Math for our Black students. For example, our Black students fell 6 percentile points in ELA proficiency, 5 in ELA learning gains, 3 in learnings gains in our lower quartile, and 10 in learning gains in mathematics in the lower quartile.

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

1. As evidenced by the 2020 FSA, Improve Learning Gains in ELA from 33% to 38% for our Lowest 25%.
2 As evidenced by the 2020 FSA, Improve Learning Gains in Math from 29% to 34% for our Lowest 25%.
3. As evidenced by the 2020 FSA, Improve Learning Gains in ELA and Math for ESE Students.
4. Improve school-wide Learning gains in ELA from 44% to 49% and in Math from 38% to 43%.
5. Improve school-wide attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing ELA Learnings Gains in Lower Quartile
Rationale	The school's ELA Learning Gains in our Lowest Quartile went from 33% to 31%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As evidenced by the 2020 FSA, Improve Learning Gains in ELA from 31% to 36% for our Lowest 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charlotte Jackson (charlotte.jackson@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	We are planning to incorporate Learning Stations because this strategy offers opportunities to provide differentiated, standard based instruction that will meet the diverse needs of our student population. Learning Stations is center based instruction focusing on the need of the students. Each station has a seperate learning objective and stations are created based on student data/student needs. As our school has a large ELL and ESe population and our students are a various academic levels, we feel this the best method of providing equitable access to the curriculum and standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on the 2019-2019 FSA ELA data, it is evident that our Hispanic, Black, and SWD students' ELA scores are well below the District and State averages. This strategy was selected because it provides our teachers with a method of reaching all students.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide Reading and English Teachers on Learning Stations. 2. Plan lesson activities during PLCs. 3. Monitor the implementation of Learning Stations. 4. Provide feedback to teachers during PLCs. 5. Monitor Common Assessments after a month of incorporating Learning Stations.
Person Responsible	Charlotte Jackson (charlotte.jackson@browardschools.com)

#2	
Title	Increasing Mathematics Learning Gains in Lower Quartile
Rationale	In 2019, our school's proficiency in the lower 25% quartile decreased from 36% to 29%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As evidenced by the 2020 FSA, Improve Learning Gains in Math from 29% to 34% for our Lowest 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Miderland Delance (miderland.delance@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Real World Problem Solving Strategies and Hands on Mathematics Training was selected because as evidenced by a teacher survey, many of our students are lacking the fundamental skills and engagement necessary to access the rigorous Florida Mathematics Standards. Real-World Problem solving allows students to approach problem solving in a realistic method that they can relate to. Hands on Mathematics provides the students with tactical methods of learning; therefore, allow equity in accessing the curriculum and the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As evidenced by the 2018-2109 FSA Mathematics scores, our school's scores in both Algebra and Geometry are well below the District and the State's averages. By incorporating Real World Problem Solving and Hands on Math, our students engagement will increase and simultaneously, more equitable access to the curriculum and standard will be provided.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide training for Algebra and Geometry teachers. 2. Create differentiated lessons during PLCs. 3. Monitor the implementation of the strategies. 4. Provide feedback during PLCs. 5. Create Common Assessments to monitor the strategies.
Person Responsible	Miderland Delance (miderland.delance@browardschools.com)

#3	
Title	Increase SWD Learning Gains and Mathematics Learning Gains.
Rationale	We have failed to meet proficiency with our ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities at 37%. Our SWD students are well below the District and State Averages in Mathematics .

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As evidenced by the 2019-2010 FSA ELA and Mathematics test scores, our SWD students will increase in Mathematics from 26% to 31% and our ESSA rating will increase from 37% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Reed (denise.reed@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	We choose to add an Instructional Facilatator with a Mathematics Background. By providing students with mathematics support from a Mathematics teacher with a dual certification in ESE, we will be providing our students with extra support in addition to other ESE strategies provided by their regular math instructor. The Assistant Principal has a Math Background and will be able to better monitor the achievement of our SWD students. Differentiated Learning through Learning Stations, Hands on Math, and Real-World Problem solving will also allow equitable access to the mathematics standards and curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our SWD students FSA scores in Mathematics are far below the District and State averages. Our SWD students require differentiated instruction and additional support in order to access the curriculum and the standards. By providing the above mentioned strategies, we are confident that our SWD students will improve there ESSE rating from 37 to 41, and Learning Gains from 26% to 31%.

Action Step	
Description	1. Hire an ESE Support Facilitator with a Mathematics Background.. 2. Hire an Assistant Principal with a Mathematics Background. 3. Provide Math teachers with Hands on Learning and Real-World Problem Solving Training. 4. Plan implementation of trainings during PLCs. 5. Monitor the implementation and plan for remediation.
Person Responsible	Denise Reed (denise.reed@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).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing ELA Learnings Gains in Lower Quartile				$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1711 - Deerfield Beach High School	General Fund		$6,000.00
			Notes: Funds will be used to providing tutoring to students in the lowest quartile in reading.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing Mathematics Learning Gains in Lower Quartile				$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1711 - Deerfield Beach High School	General Fund		$6,000.00
			Notes: Funds will be used to provide tutoring and purchase math resources to address the needs of students in the lowest quartile.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase SWD Learning Gains and Mathematics Learning Gains.				$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1711 - Deerfield Beach High School	General Fund		$6,000.00
					Total:	**$18,000.00**