

Broward County Public Schools

# Boyd H. Anderson High School



## 2020-21 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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>19</b> |

# Boyd H. Anderson High School

3050 NW 41ST ST, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33309

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: James Griffin**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (41%)<br>2017-18: C (41%)<br>2016-17: C (41%)<br>2015-16: C (41%)   |
| <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>   | TS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## 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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>19</b> |

## Boyd H. Anderson High School

3050 NW 41ST ST, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33309

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>9-12                              | No                     | 71%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 99%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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.

Boyd H. Anderson High School understands that in order to succeed in the 21st century, graduates need to have as many tools at their disposal as possible. With this in mind, the school's mission, through open-minded inquiry-based learning, we will empower students to be college and career ready to succeed in a global society.

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

Our school's vision is operated using intellectual, structural, and relationship capital. All leaders are committed to employing teaching and learning strategies that encourage forward movement by building relationships in each of the aforementioned capacities. Implementing these strategies allows the staff to provide individualized schedules created to serve students' academic needs. Programs such as Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), International Baccalaureate (IB), Health and Wellness, and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) ensure students have the choice to pursue advanced academic programs which would allow them to be prepared for college level courses and career pathways.

In some cases, students will graduate with college credit and will enter higher education better equipped than the average freshman. If they so desire, students can also take elective classes such as culinary, Dreamweaver, and aerospace technology in which they will be able to become certified in that particular skill since the 2016-2017 school year, the Health and Wellness program has offered an EMT program. These students will be well prepared to enter the work force and begin their careers upon graduation based on their passing of their industry exams. The specific classes that are offered were chosen based on targeting multiple areas of interest for the students. The school is staffed with teachers who are certified within their areas of expertise. Each teacher works collaboratively with the school to provide instruction that is geared towards the individual student through differentiation.

### 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   |
|-------------------|------------------------|---|
| Griffin, James    | Principal              | The principal is the school's curriculum leader. He manages the operations of the school. He also helps ensure the social emotional well being of students as well as other stakeholders. He is responsible for developing academic strategies. These strategies are geared toward creating a safe teaching-learning environment conducive to helping students move toward college and career attainment.   |
| Ford, Kristie     | Assistant Principal    | She is the assistant principal, second in command to the principal. Her duties and responsibilities include but are not limited to working directly with teachers, other administrators, faculty and staff members to help ensure that the principal academic, social and emotional learning strategies are implemented.  |
| Thelwell, Jenny   | Teacher, ESE           | The ESE Specialist is responsible for ensuring all Individual Education Plans (IEPs) are current. The role of the ESE Specialist also includes all accommodations are being implemented by all teachers and staff.  |
| Thomas, Sabrina   | School Counselor       | The school counselor is first and foremost a student advocate. This job duty is achieved through listening and conferencing with all shareholders including students, parents, teachers, and community members. The school counselor works directly with these stakeholders to assist students in achieving their individual college and career goals. Additionally, the school counselor works to help develop the social emotional learning skills of the students. |
| Duperval, Marie   | Teacher, K-12          | This teacher is the International Baccalaureate (IB) magnet coordinator. Her responsibilities include ensuring all audits are in compliance as well as being the curriculum supervisor. She meets with teachers to ensure the lesson plans are aligned to ensure students meet academic growth.   |
| Williams, Beverly | Administrative Support | Ms. Williams is the Security Specialist at Boyd Anderson High School. Her main responsibility is to ensure the safety of students and staff during school hours. However, she also secures the campus for special events such as sports.  |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 8/19/2020, James Griffin

**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.*



**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.*

69

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

80

### Demographic Data

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (41%)<br>2017-18: C (41%)<br>2016-17: C (41%)<br>2015-16: C (41%)   |
| <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>   | TS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

### 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 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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 | 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 ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

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

**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  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

Thursday 9/10/2020

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |     | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 599 | 513 | 432 | 405 | 1949  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13  | 14  | 15  | 12  | 54    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25  | 21  | 13  | 13  | 72    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 17  | 12  | 12  | 79    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59  | 67  | 75  | 75  | 276   |

**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 | 0 | 39 | 30 | 20 | 12 | 101   |

**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  | 7  | 7     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6  | 5  | 6  | 24    |

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |     | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 599 | 513 | 432 | 405 | 1949  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13  | 14  | 15  | 12  | 54    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25  | 21  | 13  | 13  | 72    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 17  | 12  | 12  | 79    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59  | 67  | 75  | 75  | 276   |

**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 | 0 | 39 | 30 | 20 | 12 | 101   |

**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  | 7  | 7     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6  | 5  | 6  | 24    |

**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             | 24%    | 57%      | 56%   | 20%    | 56%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 38%    | 52%      | 51%   | 34%    | 51%      | 49%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 43%    | 45%      | 42%   | 37%    | 43%      | 41%   |
| Math Achievement            | 22%    | 51%      | 51%   | 17%    | 50%      | 49%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 24%    | 44%      | 48%   | 26%    | 43%      | 44%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 28%    | 43%      | 45%   | 37%    | 38%      | 39%   |
| Science Achievement         | 41%    | 66%      | 68%   | 55%    | 62%      | 65%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 31%    | 71%      | 73%   | 37%    | 68%      | 70%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | 9                                 | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 09                    | 2019 | 24%    | 57%      | -33%                       | 55%   | -31%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 24%    | 55%      | -31%                       | 53%   | -29%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                    | 2019 | 19%    | 53%      | -34%                       | 53%   | -34%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 15%    | 53%      | -38%                       | 53%   | -38%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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        | 39%    | 67%      | -28%                  | 67%   | -28%               |
| 2018        | 43%    | 62%      | -19%                  | 65%   | -22%               |
| Compare     |        | -4%      |                       |       |                    |
| 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         | 30%    | 67%      | -37%                  | 70%   | -40%               |
| 2018         | 47%    | 66%      | -19%                  | 68%   | -21%               |
| Compare      |        | -17%     |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 25%    | 61%      | -36%                  | 61%   | -36%               |
| 2018         | 18%    | 63%      | -45%                  | 62%   | -44%               |
| Compare      |        | 7%       |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 16%    | 56%      | -40%                  | 57%   | -41%               |
| 2018         | 15%    | 51%      | -36%                  | 56%   | -41%               |
| Compare      |        | 1%       |                       |       |                    |

## 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                                       | 17       | 36     | 40          | 15        | 15      | 22           | 28       | 25      |           | 88                | 19                  |
| ELL                                       | 13       | 42     | 49          | 20        | 22      | 27           | 33       | 30      |           | 90                | 69                  |
| BLK                                       | 23       | 38     | 43          | 21        | 23      | 27           | 38       | 31      |           | 94                | 67                  |
| HSP                                       | 24       | 41     | 45          | 24        | 30      |              | 63       | 45      |           | 94                | 75                  |
| FRL                                       | 23       | 38     | 45          | 22        | 22      | 24           | 42       | 31      |           | 95                | 68                  |
| 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                                       | 18       | 35     | 33          | 20        | 28      |              | 33       | 45      |           | 71                | 73                  |
| ELL                                       | 10       | 35     | 38          | 11        | 19      | 18           | 30       | 29      |           | 85                | 73                  |
| BLK                                       | 20       | 35     | 37          | 16        | 21      | 24           | 40       | 49      |           | 92                | 74                  |
| HSP                                       | 31       | 34     | 7           | 34        | 28      |              | 75       | 53      |           | 95                | 85                  |
| MUL                                       | 40       |        |             | 67        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 21       | 35     | 35          | 18        | 24      | 24           | 44       | 50      |           | 91                | 74                  |
| 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                                       | 1        | 27     | 39          | 9         | 8       |              | 32       | 19      |           | 78                | 32                  |
| ELL                                       | 7        | 33     | 36          | 21        | 39      |              | 36       | 41      |           | 97                | 50                  |
| ASN                                       |          |        |             |           | 90      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 20       | 33     | 35          | 15        | 22      | 38           | 54       | 36      |           | 92                | 55                  |

| 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 |
| HSP                                       | 20       | 39     | 50          | 24        | 25      |              | 59       | 48      |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 20       | 34     | 36          | 18        | 27      | 37           | 57       | 38      |           | 94                | 61                  |

### 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  | 42   |
| 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 | 54   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 467  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 11   |
| Percent Tested  | 98%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| 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%       | 1    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 41   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         | 0    |
| Asian Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  |      |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | N/A  |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 42  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 50  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 42  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

The lowest performance component for the year 2020 is ELA. An influx of Level 1 students who are under grade level contributed to low performance in this area. We also had a high number of absences which included students with 1 or more suspensions.

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

Social Studies is the component depicting the greatest decline in the year 2020. An influx of Level 1 students who are under grade level contributed to low performance in this area. We also had a high number of absences which included students with 1 or more suspensions.

**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 when compared to the state average was the Math achievement component. An influx of Level 1 students who are under grade level contributed to low performance in this area. We also had a high number of absences which included students with 1 or more suspensions.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA lowest 25th percentile. The actions that we took to see these results were to group the students homogeneously. Boyd Anderson also implemented the use of various teaching tools such as Khan Academy and NewsELA with consistency and fidelity.

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

Students whose attendance falls below 90 percent present, including students with one or more suspensions. Secondly, students who have earned failing grades in ELA or Math.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
3. Attendance
4. Failing grades in ELA
5. Failing grades in Math

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Due to the data, ESE students scored under 40% on the standardized testing. This year to support students with disabilities (SWD) who are on a standard high school diploma track, support facilitators and speech and language pathologists will be pushing into algebra, geometry and English 1 and 2 courses. Because teachers in these areas are utilizing teacher led centers, students with disabilities will receive explicit instruction during this time by benefiting from 2 teacher led centers instead of just 1. Also, SWDs who scored at a level 1 in reading and math are double blocked for each subject for additional support in these core areas.

**Measurable Outcome:**

By June of 2021, SWD will score at or above 41% FPPI.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kristie Ford (kristie.ford@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

FSA scores will be use as evidence of academic baseline data. This baseline data will in turn be used, along with the students' IEP, to determine their instructional needs. Common PLC and/or common planning for teachers shared with support staff members will be the evidence-based strategy implemented to address the students' academic needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

The research shows that this strategy has been proven repeatedly to have a positive effect on student academic achievement. Some examples of its benefits are lesson planning, comparing IEP goals to the actually lesson being taught and how these two can be merged to ensure academic learning gains.

**Action Steps to Implement**

The leadership team will identifying Level 1 SWDs and their instructors to develop a schedule in which SWD support facilitators can provide extra assistance within the classroom. Students with IEPs will receive services using an inclusive model which will prevent them from missing any information if they are pulled out for services. Support facilitators will assist specifically in English and math core subject areas to ensure learning gains. Lastly, level 1 teachers and ESE support staff will plan together during PLC.

**Person Responsible**

Kristie Ford (kristie.ford@browardschools.com)

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Based on the school student population, the data reflects 19% of students are currently at or above level 2 English Language Arts (ELA) scores.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | By June of 2021, reading levels will increase so that at least 36% of students will be at level 3 proficiency English Language Arts (ELA) scores.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | James Griffin (james.f.griffin@browardschools.com)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Evidence-based strategies will be implemented in an effort to help these students meet Level 3 ELA proficiency. Strategy one will be structured Professional Learning Communities (PLC's). Strategy two will be implementing focus groups to assist teachers through the coaching process to help build teacher capacity. Strategy three will be the implementation of teacher-led literacy stations. Communication, as strategy four will be employed throughout the process ensuring that student classroom schedules align to the literacy plan.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | The rationale for strategy one PLC's is to create a school environment conducive for teacher collaboration which helps ensure that teacher lessons are aligned to state literacy standards. The rationale for strategy two, focus group implementation is to obtain teacher practice throughout the coaching process to assist with continued progress monitoring. The rationale for strategy three, teacher-led literacy stations, is that they afford teachers with the opportunity to plan and implement literacy lessons in a small group setting geared toward enhancing learning through enrichment as well as remediation to correct misconceptions. The rationale for strategy four, communication is to gain clarification that all stakeholders have a common understanding of the teaching learning goal. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. I do - Teacher Literacy Stations
2. We do - Focus Groups to build teacher capacity and Communication
3. You do - Structured PLC's
4. Cycle continues with progress monitoring throughout each action step

**Person Responsible** James Griffin (james.f.griffin@browardschools.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Strategic scheduling will be used in an effort to address the ESE school wide improvement priority. Strategic scheduling will be employed with the students by scheduling them homogeneously. Additionally strategic scheduling will be employed with the support staff. These support teachers by ensuring the ESE students have their academic support as aligned with their IEP by differentiating instruction such as with small group.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

All stakeholders have a voice in the school wide procedures and budget through the School Advisory Council (SAC). Voting members are those who represent the school staff, students, community members and partners. Administrators take an active role in how information is disseminated to ensure that a positive environment is achieved within the school building and in the community. Also, staff and students are rewarded for achievements in academically, culturally, and positive feedback.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

## Part V: Budget

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

|               |               |  |  |                |       |                     |
|---------------|---------------|--|--|----------------|-------|---------------------|
| <b>1</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b> |  |                |       | <b>\$30,000.00</b>  |
|               | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE   | 2020-21             |
|               | 2110          | 100-Salaries   | 1741 - Boyd H. Anderson High School  | Other Federal  | 200.0 | \$30,000.00         |
|               |               |  | Notes: Boyd Anderson was awarded a grant to help 9th grade students in the lowest quartile close the gap in academic achievement in ELA. We were given 3 AmeriCorp Ambassadors to tutor and help design and implement individualized academic plans to meet their needs. |                |       |                     |
| <b>2</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>               |  |                |       | <b>\$112,000.00</b> |
|               | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE   | 2020-21             |
|               | 2110          | 120-Classroom Teachers   | 1741 - Boyd H. Anderson High School  | General Fund   | 800.0 | \$112,000.00        |
|               |               |  | Notes: To increase proficiency levels, support classes such as Creative Writing and Intensive Reading were implemented into the ELA infrastructure. Monies were allocated to hire 2 new teachers to teach these courses.   |                |       |                     |
| <b>Total:</b> |               |  |  |                |       | <b>\$142,000.00</b> |