

Broward County Public Schools

# J. P. Taravella 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

# J. P. Taravella High School

10600 RIVERSIDE DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Marietta De Armas**

Start Date for this Principal: 10/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<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, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

# J. P. Taravella High School

10600 RIVERSIDE DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[ 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	54%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

## School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

## 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.

Building relationships to make lasting impressions while motivating, educating, and graduating our students.

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

To prepare students to be college and career ready.

### 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
De Armas, Marietta	Principal	Instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical leadership

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 10/1/2020, Marietta De Armas

**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.*

4

**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.*

14

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

120

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<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	669	702	695	740	2806
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	74	76	80	316
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	212	140	108	154	614
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	181	198	154	717
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	111	139	6	420
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	86	0	0	248

**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	1	2	7	0	10

**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	6	3	3	12	24

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

Thursday 10/1/2020

**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	662	700	760	776	2898	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	82	116	85	342	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	22	4	54	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	466	440	319	1534	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	194	210	165	710	

**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	145	261	283	164	853

**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	52	41	36	165	294	

**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	662	700	760	776	2898	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	82	116	85	342	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	22	4	54	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	466	440	319	1534	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	194	210	165	710	

**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	145	261	283	164	853	

**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	52	41	36	165	294	

**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	47%	57%	56%	50%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	52%	51%	47%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	45%	42%	38%	43%	41%
Math Achievement	43%	51%	51%	50%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	42%	44%	48%	41%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	43%	45%	35%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	66%	66%	68%	61%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	71%	73%	78%	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	47%	57%	-10%	55%	-8%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	53%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

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	65%	67%	-2%	67%	-2%
2018	58%	62%	-4%	65%	-7%
Compare		7%			
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	74%	67%	7%	70%	4%
2018	73%	66%	7%	68%	5%
Compare		1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	39%	61%	-22%	61%	-22%
2018	36%	63%	-27%	62%	-26%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	46%	56%	-10%	57%	-11%
2018	36%	51%	-15%	56%	-20%
Compare		10%			

## 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	33	33	24	35	30	42	46		87	25
ELL	31	44	40	37	50	49	56	56		69	48
ASN	54	49		55	48		75	91		92	83
BLK	38	43	38	35	35	31	54	70		91	38
HSP	48	42	32	42	47	41	67	72		89	55
MUL	61	54	43	48	44		75	86		96	36
WHT	57	46	38	56	45	32	78	83		94	56
FRL	40	42	36	39	43	39	60	72		90	45
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	24	36	38	15	25	28	44	52		72	32
ELL	22	34	31	28	36	40	28	64		83	51
ASN	64	57		56	35		76	80		95	56
BLK	42	47	46	24	32	36	47	69		91	29
HSP	52	46	36	39	39	40	58	75		90	53
MUL	72	63		52	39		76	64		90	42
WHT	63	51	41	49	37	34	70	82		92	56
FRL	47	46	42	32	33	35	53	72		89	40

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	18	30	31	27	31	13	19	51		82	23
ELL	18	37	32	33	40	31	36	48		71	37
ASN	68	50		68	54		77	86		91	75
BLK	40	42	39	40	39	34	48	70		93	40
HSP	50	47	34	50	42	34	66	77		90	49
MUL	63	59	67	55	49	42	54	79		100	27
WHT	61	52	39	61	41	36	71	87		93	55
FRL	44	44	37	45	37	30	52	73		91	40

### 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	53
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	68
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	47
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	53
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	60
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 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	59
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	51
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 Lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance with a score of 36% for the 2019 school year. The necessary improvement in daily exposure to mathematical content. Authentic practice of standardized assessments as assigned by instructors. This resulted in a plateauing of student performance.

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

Overall, ELA performance declined by 15% with a 5% average in the three subcategories. The need for improvement of the school wide literacy plan.

**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.**

ELA Achievement and Math Lowest 25th percentile had the largest gap of 9% when compared to the State. The factors that contributed to this gap are indicated above.

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

Science Achievement showed the most improvement with an increase of 7%. This improvement resulted from authentic PLC, data driven instructional design and assessments, and continuous collaboration.

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

Attendance and Failing Students in ELA

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
4. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
5. ESE Performance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Areas of focus are reading comprehension, vocabulary and fluency. These needs were identified using the FAIR assessment provided by FLDOE.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Based on the results from the FSA, ACT and SAT. The school will increase the literacy scores by 5%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Marietta De Armas (mary.dearmas@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Monitoring Comprehension - Use of Assessments and using the data gathered to make immediate changes for student achieve immediately at the classroom level

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Mastery Connect will be used as the inhouse assessment tool to monitor the student improvement and the expected improvement. Teachers will provide monthly assessment on literacy standards using MasteryConnect. MasteryConnect will then provide comprehensive reports for each student and show mastery or near mastery for the assessed standard.

**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 School Leadership team will focus on improving authentic schoolwide PLC, data driven instructional design and assessments, continuous collaboration, and implement a comprehensive schoolwide literacy plan.**

**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.

SAC meetings are held monthly. During these monthly meetings stakeholders are provide information about each department's performance. Additionally, the principal provides an overall review of school's academic and social emotional progress of staff and students. The SAC Committee solicits input, comments, or concerns which are addressed and reviewed continuously. There is an overall positive environment that is observed among the stakeholders as evident by their continued involvement and engagement.

#### 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: ELA				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			2751 - J. P. Taravella High School	School Improvement Funds		\$10,000.00
			Notes: Achieve 3000 Online platform for all ELA courses - \$10000			
Total:						\$10,000.00