

Broward County Public Schools

Whiddon Rodgers Education Center



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 | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Whiddon Rodgers Education Center

700 SW 26TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33315

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Wylie Howard

Start Date for this Principal: 2/4/2015

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade |
| 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 | CS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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 | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Whiddon Rodgers Education Center

700 SW 26TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33315

[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 6-12 | No | % |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| Alternative Education | No | % |

School Grades History

| Year | 2012-13 |
|-------|---------|
| Grade | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide appropriate alternative educational strategies and resources that support social emotional growth and instill a desire to become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to become a nationally recognized school of excellence in innovative educational alternatives designed to prepare students for college and careers.

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Howard, Wylie | Principal | Lead teachers and staff, set goals for the school and work to meet academic needs of all students. Overseeing school operations, budgets, discipline, and hiring and ensuring that each is efficiently producing positive results. |
| Ross, Stacey | SAC Member | Monitor the State and District School Improvement plan. |
| Mckee-Savage, Esther | Assistant Principal | Assists the Principal with the teachers and staff, by carrying out goals for the school to meet academic needs of all students. Overseeing school operations, budgets, discipline, and hiring and ensuring that each is efficiently producing positive results. |
| Previl, Dania | SAC Member | Monitor the State and District School Improvement plan. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 2/4/2015, Wylie Howard

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.*

0

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade |
| 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 | CS&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 | 1 | 36 | 75 | 73 | 141 | 211 | 423 | 960 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 52 | 60 | 111 | 172 | 326 | 747 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 40 | 22 | 48 | 65 | 70 | 266 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 65 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 65 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 49 | 33 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 143 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 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 | 31 | 53 | 33 | 60 | 86 | 221 | 484 |

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 | 8 | 189 | 197 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 31 | 34 | 46 | 118 | 279 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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 | 1 | 8 | 77 | 99 | 143 | 283 | 600 | 1211 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 52 | 67 | 69 | 80 | 69 | 425 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 58 | 47 | 50 | 47 | 24 | 276 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 50 | 58 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 216 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 92 | 95 | 94 | 92 | 96 | 569 | |

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 | 88 | 86 | 64 | 64 | 68 | 53 | 423 |

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 | 50 | 27 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 103 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 43 | 44 | 29 | 14 | 26 | 244 | |

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 | 1 | 13 | 61 | 59 | 91 | 138 | 265 | 628 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 65 | 104 | 229 | 409 | 855 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 41 | 45 | 72 | 137 | 142 | 446 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 41 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 73 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 49 | 33 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 143 | |

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 | 13 | 61 | 59 | 91 | 138 | 265 | 627 | |

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 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 188 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 31 | 44 | 45 | 39 | 156 | 324 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 0% | 57% | 56% | 0% | 56% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 0% | 52% | 51% | 0% | 51% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 45% | 42% | 0% | 43% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 0% | 51% | 51% | 0% | 50% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 0% | 44% | 48% | 0% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 43% | 45% | 0% | 38% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 0% | 66% | 68% | 0% | 62% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 0% | 71% | 73% | 0% | 68% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 0% | 55% | -55% | 52% | -52% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 51% | -51% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 7% | 59% | -52% | 56% | -49% |
| | 2018 | 2% | 60% | -58% | 58% | -56% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 09 | 2019 | 0% | 57% | -57% | 55% | -55% |
| | 2018 | 5% | 55% | -50% | 53% | -48% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 5% | 53% | -48% | 53% | -48% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 53% | -53% | 53% | -53% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 0% | 53% | -53% | 54% | -54% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 54% | -54% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 2% | 45% | -43% | 46% | -44% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 47% | -47% | 45% | -45% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 1% | 43% | -42% | 48% | -47% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 45% | -45% | 50% | -50% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 1% | 67% | -66% | 67% | -66% |
| 2018 | 6% | 62% | -56% | 65% | -59% |
| Compare | | -5% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 71% | -71% | 71% | -71% |
| 2018 | 0% | 70% | -70% | 71% | -71% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 5% | 67% | -62% | 70% | -65% |
| 2018 | 7% | 66% | -59% | 68% | -61% |
| Compare | | -2% | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 1% | 61% | -60% | 61% | -60% |
| 2018 | 25% | 63% | -38% | 62% | -37% |
| Compare | | -24% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 57% | -57% |
| 2018 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 56% | -56% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | 35 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | 19 | 10 |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | 17 | 8 |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | 23 | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | 17 | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | 18 | 7 |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | CS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 19 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 33 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 56 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 3 |
| Percent Tested | |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 18 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 21 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| 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 |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 19 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 17 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| 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 | 17 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 20 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |

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 following data shows our Hispanic and white students have the lowest performance. The main contributing factor for Hispanic students is the language barrier. The majority of our ELL students are new to the country and exhibit little to no English Language competency. Barriers for white students include low attendance, low socioeconomic status, and being a minority in our student population. 80% of the student population is Black/African American.

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

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Florida state testing was waived for the 2019 - 2020 school year.

From the prior year, we had a decline of grade-level data within our 9th-grade cohort from 5% in 2018 to 0% in 2019. Factors that could have contributed to this decline could be the number of students tested and their Level 1 rating, out of the 34 students tested, 33 students achieved a Level 1 on the ELA assessment.

We also had a decline in our Algebra EOC from 25% in 2018 to 1% in 2019. This decline could have been a strategic focus within the department to help our students graduate by successfully passing the PERT assessment verses the Algebra EOC.

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 data component with the greatest gap was the Civics EOC with -71%. The factors that contribute to this gap is the lack of student motivation to pass the test. Additionally, students are deficient and are at a level 1 on foundational skills in Reading.

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 were white students based on the federal index, with an increase of 3%. Our school increased our student outreach and made regular contact with the students, their parents, and teachers in order to monitor their attendance, behavior and academics.

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

Per the Early Warning Systems data from Part I, we have identified our area of concern as being attendance. 747 students of the 960 enrolled(78%) in grade levels 6-12 have attendance below 90%. Additionally, students with one or more total suspensions in 2020 was 260 students (28% of student population), 286 students achieved level 1 in ELA or Math in 2019.

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

1. Increase student achievement in all academic areas
2. Improve student attendance
3. Provide additional support based on demographics: Whites, Hispanics, African-Americans, Economically disadvantaged, English Language Learners
4. Monitor students as needed to ensure that all learners are receiving social-emotional support
5. Reduce the number of student suspensions by using PBIS and PASL program and monitor as warranted through HERO application.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Hispanic students were the lowest ESSA Subgroup for 2018-19, they had a Federal Percent of Points Index of 17%

Measurable Outcome:

For the 2020-21 school year, the Hispanic student's Federal Percent of Points Index will increase by 5%. This goal is based on our previous years increase from 13% to 17%, which was a 4% increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wylie Howard (wylie.howard@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Whiddon-Rogers Education Center's Hispanic students will receive additional support through our Latinos in Action (LIA) group, which is an established club on our campus modeled after Achievement for Latinos through Academic Success (ALAS). LIA is an intervention for middle and high school students that is designed to address student, school, family and community factors that affect dropping out. Each student is assigned a counselor or mentor who monitors attendance, behavior, and academic achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) reviewed one study on ALAS that met WWC standards. This study found potentially positive effects on staying in school and potentially positive effects on progressing in school.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify Hispanic students at-risk for chronic absenteeism, low academic performance, and behavior problems 2. Monitor attendance, behavior, and academics of the identified students 3. Assign students a mentor/counselor to monitor progress 4. Engage students' families through the Latinos in Action club 5. Connect students and families to community services

Person Responsible

Wylie Howard (wylie.howard@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

After meeting with the leadership team we reflected on the data and realized we could increase student achievement with a positive culture shift. The data showed 28% of our students have been suspended multiple times, 78% of the students were not attending school on a regular basis, therefore a positive climate change could help increase student attendance and instruction time.

In creating a School-wide Positive Behavior (SWPBP) Team involving all stakeholders we facilitated monthly meetings to evaluate the top school-wide behavior infractions to make decisions on effectiveness, equity, and positive culture change within our school.

We created an SWPBP survey to gain feedback from all stakeholders on reward system items. Based on the survey results we created the SWPBP "WREC emporium" to implement a focus on positive interactions between our teachers and students.

In order to communicate the expectations and performance information for all our stakeholders, we created professional development training, quarterly lesson plans, morning announcements, as well as PSAs for our School news and social media forums. Based on the decisions and communications or school decreased the number of referrals by 53% and we had an increase of 50% HERO usage, our student behavior management software by our teachers.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic | | | | \$3,000.00 |
|---------------|----------|---|---|----------------|-----|-------------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0452 - Whiddon Rodgers Ed. Center | General Fund | | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Hispanic students will receive additional support through our Latinos in Action(LIA) group. LIA will address student, school, family and community factors that address dropping out. These funds will be used to support the students and families to increase their academic success | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$3,000.00 |