

Broward County Public Schools

Piper High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Piper High School

8000 NW 44TH ST, Lauderhill, FL 33351

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Marie Hautigan

Start Date for this Principal: 10/2/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 86% |
| 2019-20 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 (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Piper High School

8000 NW 44TH ST, Lauderdale, FL 33351

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | No | 65% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 91% |

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.

"We, the Piper High School Community, recognize the needs of our diverse population and are committed to ensure that all students receive an outstanding education, within a safe and secure environment."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Hautigan , Marie | Principal | The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities. |
| Boyett, Jamie | Administrative Support | Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Specialists are responsible for providing support to schools to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or Access curriculum, statewide assessments, and accountability systems. |
| Gaygan, Jillian | School Counselor | The Guidance Director organizes, supervises, and evaluates the work of the guidance counselors at all levels. |
| Schuck, Jacqueline | Administrative Support | The ESOL Coordinator is responsible for planning and administering the district ESOL program and all state reporting. |
| Lewis, Matthew | Administrative Support | As the behavioral specialist, the individual responsible for assessing students with behavior issues, collecting data on the students, working with teachers, counselors and school psychologists to devise a behavior plan for the student and evaluating the effectiveness of the plan. |
| Kothe, Patrick | Assistant Principal | The role of an assistant principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 10/2/2020, Marie Hautigan

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.*

21

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.*

80

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

103

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 86% |
| 2019-20 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 (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 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 . | |

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 | 608 | 533 | 533 | 538 | 2212 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 72 | 79 | 105 | 382 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 150 | 125 | 333 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 90 | 75 | 210 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 146 | 125 | 46 | 506 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 344 |

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 | 140 | 160 | 120 | 85 | 505 |

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 | 49 | 49 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 28 | 34 | 21 | 109 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/2/2020

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 | 578 | 571 | 538 | 605 | 2292 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 105 | 108 | 155 | 440 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 23 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 12 | 96 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 126 | 226 | 189 | 557 |

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 | 28 | 34 | 30 | 19 | 111 |

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 | 3 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 15 | 10 | 40 |

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 | 578 | 571 | 538 | 605 | 2292 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 105 | 108 | 155 | 440 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 23 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 12 | 96 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 126 | 226 | 189 | 557 |

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 | 28 | 34 | 30 | 19 | 111 |

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 | 3 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 15 | 10 | 40 |

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 | 38% | 57% | 56% | 39% | 56% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 51% | 52% | 51% | 40% | 51% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 45% | 42% | 33% | 43% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 29% | 51% | 51% | 39% | 50% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 35% | 44% | 48% | 35% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 29% | 43% | 45% | 26% | 38% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 54% | 66% | 68% | 52% | 62% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 53% | 71% | 73% | 54% | 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 | 42% | 57% | -15% | 55% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 30% | 55% | -25% | 53% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 31% | 53% | -22% | 53% | -22% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 53% | -14% | 53% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |

| 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 | 54% | 67% | -13% | 67% | -13% |
| 2018 | 51% | 62% | -11% | 65% | -14% |
| 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 | 52% | 67% | -15% | 70% | -18% |
| 2018 | 54% | 66% | -12% | 68% | -14% |
| Compare | | -2% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 25% | 61% | -36% | 61% | -36% |
| 2018 | 24% | 63% | -39% | 62% | -38% |
| Compare | | 1% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 31% | 56% | -25% | 57% | -26% |
| 2018 | 29% | 51% | -22% | 56% | -27% |
| Compare | | 2% | | | |

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 | 23 | 40 | 33 | 21 | 29 | 13 | 32 | 33 | | 94 | 21 |
| ELL | 14 | 46 | 51 | 17 | 32 | 33 | 32 | 33 | | 84 | 55 |
| ASN | 56 | 53 | | 36 | 33 | | | 80 | | 100 | 71 |
| BLK | 33 | 50 | 41 | 26 | 33 | 29 | 51 | 48 | | 95 | 43 |

| 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 |
| HSP | 46 | 55 | 64 | 34 | 42 | 33 | 57 | 65 | | 94 | 55 |
| MUL | 72 | 65 | | 29 | 14 | | 67 | 56 | | 100 | 69 |
| WHT | 49 | 47 | 27 | 49 | 46 | | 60 | 64 | | 96 | 60 |
| FRL | 35 | 49 | 44 | 26 | 32 | 27 | 51 | 48 | | 95 | 47 |
| 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 | 15 | 31 | 21 | 19 | 43 | 36 | 21 | 36 | | 76 | 27 |
| ELL | 11 | 35 | 32 | 16 | 22 | 23 | 40 | 22 | | 81 | 62 |
| ASN | 50 | 47 | | 45 | | | | 65 | | 94 | 69 |
| BLK | 31 | 44 | 37 | 24 | 33 | 29 | 48 | 45 | | 90 | 45 |
| HSP | 47 | 46 | 32 | 40 | 43 | 22 | 58 | 71 | | 90 | 63 |
| MUL | 59 | 63 | | 42 | 25 | | 73 | 92 | | 100 | 64 |
| WHT | 53 | 50 | 40 | 39 | 42 | 40 | 81 | 76 | | 89 | 62 |
| FRL | 34 | 44 | 37 | 27 | 35 | 28 | 48 | 50 | | 88 | 49 |
| 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 | 6 | 15 | 20 | 18 | 19 | | 29 | 22 | | 76 | 29 |
| ELL | 3 | 50 | 56 | 30 | 37 | 15 | 17 | 31 | | 51 | 57 |
| ASN | 67 | 56 | | 38 | 33 | | 73 | 75 | | 89 | 69 |
| BLK | 30 | 35 | 29 | 33 | 32 | 25 | 46 | 47 | | 83 | 38 |
| HSP | 53 | 49 | 46 | 50 | 39 | 26 | 68 | 60 | | 83 | 70 |
| MUL | 63 | 54 | | 54 | 38 | | | 57 | | 92 | 42 |
| WHT | 67 | 51 | | 45 | 40 | 35 | 69 | 73 | | 92 | 61 |
| FRL | 34 | 39 | 34 | 38 | 34 | 21 | 49 | 53 | | 82 | 46 |

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 | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 40 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 516 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 95% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 34 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 40 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 61 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 44 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 59 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|--|-----|
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 55 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| 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.

Math Achievement and Math Learning Gains are the lowest performance components. Contributing factors include a need for improved instructional practice and significant student learning gaps.

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

Social studies declined by 1% from 2018 to 2019, the greatest component decline. Contributing factors include a need for improved instructional practice and significant student learning gaps.

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.

Math achievement had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Contributing factors include a need for improved instructional practice and significant student learning gaps.

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

Both ELA Learning Gains and ELA Learning Gains in the lowest 25% showed the most improvement. School focused on instructional best practices, including aligned formative assessments, data analysis, and PLC collaboration.

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

Performance of SWD students is a significant concern.

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

1. Improved Instructional Practice
2. Improved Academic Guidance and Support
3. Improved Parent/Student Communication
4. Improved Community Partnerships
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Math Achievement was the lowest component area in the school.

Measurable Outcome:

Student achievement of the 2021 Algebra I and Geometry EOC exams will increase 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marie Hautigan (marie.hautigan@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

PLCs will meet to design common formative assessments, analyze shared data, align curricula, and share best practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The outlined strategies are evidence-based to improve student achievement and increase teacher collaboration.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Despite improvements in ELA achievement, less than half of students continue to struggle with grade-level reading comprehension. |
| Measurable Outcome: | The goal is to have a 7% increase in student performance on the FSA reading and writing assessment |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Piper will address school wide literacy through a series of evidence-based strategies, including aligned curriculum and formative assessments, data collection and analysis through PLC collaboration, school-wide professional development focused on improving student engagement through literacy, and cross-curricular literacy professional development in social studies and science. Supplemental literacy support includes the use of targeted digital platforms (Achieve 3000, USA Test Prep). Research shows that collaborative PLCs focused on curricular alignment, data collection through formative assessments, and regular analysis of student performance improves student achievement, particularly with struggling students. Additionally, school wide professional development that focuses on the sharing of best practices to engage students through literacy increases student performance across curricular areas. For struggling readers to grow, they must interact with complex texts across the school day; for this to occur, teachers in non-literacy areas must participate in professional development to align instructional capacity with the needs of the students |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | |

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will meet regularly to review specific areas of concern, oversee committees to address specific areas of concern, oversee implementation of committee recommendations, and monitor progress through student achievement data on formative assessments.

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.

The school focuses significantly on building a positive, supportive culture on campus and throughout the community. By focusing on community outreach, we have significantly increased participation in SAC/SAF/PSAT, leading to greater community involvement. We have promoted a schoolwide non-violence program developed and implemented by upperclassmen and have seen a significant drop in on-campus violence (in the months before the outbreak). We have included the city mayor and city commission in many of our school improvement projects and community outreach events.

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.

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---|--|----------------|-----|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$0.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5000 | | 1901 - Piper High School | General Fund | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Math Nation is an instructional program used for targeting students in Algebra and Geometry.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$0.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5000 | | 1901 - Piper High School | General Fund | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Achieve 3000 is a reading intervention program used with targeted students.</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$0.00 |