



---

## 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>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>24</b> |

## Dave Thomas Education Center West

4690 COCONUT CREEK PKWY, Coconut Creek, FL 33063

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Synithia Crawford**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>PK, 6-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 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>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2020-21: No Grade<br>2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade   |
| <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>   |  |
| * 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>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>24</b> |

# Dave Thomas Education Center West

4690 COCONUT CREEK PKWY, Coconut Creek, FL 33063

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School<br/>PK, 6-12</p> | <p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p> | <p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Alternative Education</p>                    | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|                     |                       |                       |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <p><b>Year</b></p>  | <p><b>2012-13</b></p> | <p><b>2012-13</b></p> |
| <p><b>Grade</b></p> |                       |                       |

## 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 a relevant, rigorous curriculum in a safe and conducive learning academic environment. With the help of parent(s)/ guardian(s), equip each student with lifelong skills and academic strategies that prepare them for college or careers in a global society.

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

Our vision is to Stimulate, Motivate, Educate, Empower, and Graduate our students to become productive members of society.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name               | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Egelsky, Perry     | Principal           | Lead teachers and staff, set goals for the school, and work to meet the academic needs of all students. Overseeing school operations, budgets, discipline, and hiring and ensuring that each is efficiently producing positive results. |
| Crawford, Synithia | Assistant Principal | Assist the principal with the vision, mission, and responsibilities of Dave Thomas Education Center and Charles Drew Family Resource Center.  |
| Drayton, Lynnette  | Assistant Principal | Assist the principal with the vision, mission, and responsibilities of Dave Thomas Education Center and Charles Drew Family Resource Center.  |
| Rolle, Kenneth     | Assistant Principal | Assist the principal with the vision, mission, and responsibilities of Dave Thomas Education Center and Charles Drew Family Resource Center.  |
| Price , Kelly      | Other               | Ensure Principal's vision and mission for Dave Thomas Education Center and Charles Drew Family Resource Center is fulfilled through community, parents, students, and business partners.  |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Synithia Crawford

**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.*

8

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

35

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

503

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

4

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

0

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

**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 | 1 | 15 | 48 | 63 | 106 | 332 | 565   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 18 | 45 | 84  | 271 | 425   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 1  | 1  | 2   | 2   | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 4  | 2  | 11  | 12  | 33    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7  | 1  | 4   | 6   | 29    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 24 | 35 | 55  | 157 | 277   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 21 | 36 | 23  | 149 | 236   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 9  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 13    |

**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 | 12 | 25 | 38 | 63 | 214 | 352   |

**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  | 0     |    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7  | 2  | 10 | 45    | 69 |

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

Friday 8/20/2021

**2020-21 - 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 | 30 | 45 | 27 | 56 | 159 | 321 | 638   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 18 | 8  | 42 | 121 | 255 | 456   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 13 | 3  | 6  | 25  | 30  | 82    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 2   | 1   | 5     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 2   | 1   | 5     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 57 | 20 | 39 | 0   | 0   | 117   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 57 | 20 | 39 | 0   | 0   | 117   |

**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 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 15 | 31 | 154 | 222   |

**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  | 116 | 116   |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 6 | 15 | 17 | 94  | 152   |

**2020-21 - 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 | 30 | 45 | 27 | 56 | 159 | 321   | 638 |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 18 | 8  | 42 | 121 | 255   | 456 |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 13 | 3  | 6  | 25  | 30    | 82  |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 2   | 1     | 5   |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 2   | 1     | 5   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 57 | 20 | 39 | 0   | 0     | 117 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 57 | 20 | 39 | 0   | 0     | 117 |

**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 | 12 | 25 | 38 | 63 | 214   | 352 |

**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     | 0  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 2  | 10 | 45    | 69 |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       |        | 58%      | 61%   |        | 57%      | 60%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       |        | 58%      | 59%   |        | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       |        | 52%      | 54%   |        | 49%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       |        | 58%      | 62%   |        | 58%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       |        | 58%      | 59%   |        | 56%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       |        | 51%      | 52%   |        | 49%      | 52%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       |        | 51%      | 56%   |        | 52%      | 57%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       |        | 74%      | 78%   |        | 75%      | 77%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 10%    | 59%      | -49%                       | 56%   | -46%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 09                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 57%      | -57%                       | 55%   | -55%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 4%     | 53%      | -49%                       | 53%   | -49%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 6%     | 45%      | -39%                       | 46%   | -40%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 1%     | 43%      | -42%                       | 48%   | -47%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 10%    | 67%      | -57%                  | 67%   | -57%               |

| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 15%    | 67%      | -52%                  | 70%   | -55%               |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 3%     | 61%      | -58%                  | 61%   | -58%               |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 2%     | 56%      | -54%                  | 57%   | -55%               |

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

- USA Testprep
- FAIR
- Khan Academy- ELA and Math:9-12
- iReady
- Ticket out the door
- Check for understanding-Civics, Geography, W. History, U.S. History, Government/Economics
- Kahoot
- Math Nation
- Summative Assessments

| Grade 6               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        |        |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        |        |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 7               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |      |        | 19     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 12     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 9      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 2      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |      |        | 19     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 12     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 9      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 2      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics                | All Students               |      |        | 2      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 0      |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 0      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 0      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 8               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |      |        | 18     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 10     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 4      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 4      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |      |        | 4      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 10     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 4      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 4      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               |      |        | 2      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 10     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 4      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 4      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 9               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |      |        | 0      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 0      |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 5      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 3      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |      |        | 0      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 6      |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 5      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 3      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology               | All Students               |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History            | All Students               |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 10              |                            |                      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall                 | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |                      |        | 3      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |        | 10     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      |        | 17     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      |        | 13     |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall   | Winter |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |                      |        | 2      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |        | 10     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      |        | 17     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      |        | 13     |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall   | Winter |
| Biology               | All Students               |                      |        | 2      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |        | 10     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      |        | 17     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      |        | 13     |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall   | Winter |
| US History            | All Students               |                      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      |        |        |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall   | Winter |

| Grade 11              |                            |                      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall                 | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |                      |        | 4      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |        | 11     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      |        | 9      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      |        | 15     |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall   | Winter |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |                      |        | 8      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |        | 11     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      |        | 9      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      |        | 15     |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall   | Winter |
| Biology               | All Students               |                      |        | 1      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |        | 4      |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      |        | 1      |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      |        | 4      |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall   | Winter |
| US History            | All Students               |                      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      |        |        |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall   | Winter |

| Grade 12              |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |      |        | 24     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 56     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 27     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 57     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |      |        | 27     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 56     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 27     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 57     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology               | All Students               |      |        | 27     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 56     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 27     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 57     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History            | All Students               |      |        | 14     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 56     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 27     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 57     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 75                | 4                   |
| ELL                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 40                | 8                   |
| BLK                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 60                | 10                  |
| HSP                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 42                |                     |
| WHT                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 41                |                     |

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| FRL                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 55                | 7                   |
| 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                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 33                |                     |
| ELL                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 15                |                     |
| BLK                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          | 6       |           | 33                | 10                  |
| HSP                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 32                | 20                  |
| WHT                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 30                |                     |
| FRL                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              | 8        | 9       |           | 34                | 9                   |
| 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 |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 33  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 5   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 33  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 98  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 3   |
| Percent Tested  |     |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 40  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 27  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 35  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 21  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| 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%            |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 41  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 31  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All grade levels and core content areas are significantly below the State and District data review for State Assessment in proficiency. Six subgroups are 41% below the Federal Index. The most evident trend shows racial demographic subgroups of Black/African, Hispanic, and White students below 32% for two consecutive years. Also, English Language Learners are below 32% for one year.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Both the Achievement Level and Learning Gains demonstrated the greatest need for improvement. The content area of ELA indicates the greatest need for improvement which is based on progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments. The school's ELA Achievement Level for the Cohort Grade Level scored the following: Grade 8 with 10% proficiency, Grade 9 with 0% proficiency, and Grade 10 with 4% proficiency.

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Attendance seems to be in direct correlation with the current ELA/Math achievement deficit. A renewed monitoring process including parent contact and possible home visits to determine other underlying attendance issues will garner increased exposure and enhancement for students demonstrating ELA and/or math deficits.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The Mathematics Learning Gains showed the most improvement based on the 2019 state assessments.

#### What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Mathematics Learning Gains at the middle and high school levels showed a continuous improvement due to the implementation of the CARE cycle. The Mathematics Department implemented the supplemental curriculum of Math Nation and Khan Academy, tested frequently with formative and summative assessments, continuously remediated for mastery, and used Kahoot software for enrichment.

#### What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Generally, the teachers need to continuously build upon the student's foundation with various learning activities. For Mathematics, students need to represent problems in multiple ways, such as graphs, tables, equations, drawings, and objects. Hence a connection is made between the concept and representation. For all subject areas, students need to use an evidenced based approach for both writing and reading the text. Additionally, graphic organizers need to be used. Next, the teacher needs to orchestrate small groups according to the student's skill mastery level. In small groups, fluency is developed. Students engage in discussions that reflect on critical thinking. Students will need additional practice by communicating about the critical content in verbal discussions and by writing. Moreover, the use of patterns and structure connect the problems and solutions. Thus, learning is accelerated.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Teachers need access and training on educational software, such as Microsoft Education package. Mathematics teachers need a new textbook adoption for all math courses. Additionally, some classrooms need technology for both the students and teacher. The textbook curriculum resources need to have superb technology that will address the learning cycle. The technology needs to diagnose, prescribe, and assess. The curriculum must address the struggling learners.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

The classroom teacher will provide both directed instruction and small group instruction for the students. For the directed instruction the board will be configured which shows the student's road map for learning. Moreover, the configured board outlines the teacher's directed instruction Learning Activity that has the following components: vocabulary, essential question, critical content, standard, learning target, and learning scale. Overall, teachers utilize a Learning Scale that will focus on the coherence of the standards-based curriculum and the rigor of the standards-based curriculum to ensure that learning is accelerating. The teacher will use an exit ticket to monitor progress of the daily instruction.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | We identified ELA/Math as a high priority due to declining scores over the last two years. These lower achievement scores impact students' ability to receive a standard high school diploma.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | By June 2022 Students will demonstrate a 2% learning gain in Math and English Language Arts based on the Florida Standards Assessment.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Students will be issued formative assessments on a bi-weekly basis. Data will be compiled and assessed to determine what, if any, alterations to instructional delivery need to be implemented. |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Perry Egelsky (perry.egelsky@browardschools.com)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Professional Learning Communities, on-going data chats with students, professional development for teachers   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | The strategies were chosen to enable teachers to share best practices and provide relevant information to students concerning academic growth while also improving teacher pedagogy.            |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities and Professional Development throughout the year. Teacher have official and unofficial data chats with students throughout the school year.

**Person Responsible** Perry Egelsky (perry.egelsky@browardschools.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

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.**

Dave Thomas Education Center and Charles Drew Family Resource Center addresses building a positive school culture by having the staff complete Broward County Public School's mandatory staff development training called Positive Behavioral Interventions. The staff development training complies with the enactment of legislation HB149 on 7-1-2021. For 2021-2022, DTEC and CDFRC focus on maximizing students' relations, skills, and choices. General interaction with students and staff entails creating an environment where all students and staff are acknowledged and respected. As a result, the staff and students form positive behavioral connections.

Next, DTEC and CDFRC actively implement positive behavior interventions and support (PBIS) to reduce problem behavior and increase desired behavior. Understanding that behavior has a purpose and function is a response to a stimulus and is related to the environment, the staff is empowered with the knowledge to address the needs of the students. The team implements proactive strategies to prevent problems, identifies deficient behavioral skills, teaches new behavioral skills, and changes how to respond to a behavioral problem.

Moreover, the PBIS model commences with the staff using a positive approach to focus on interacting and supporting the students and increasing the positive behavior instead of reacting and managing the aftermath divisive behavior. DTEC and CDFRC strive to achieve the research recommended five to one ratio of interacting positively with students. Thus, the quality of life for both the staff and students is a harmonious team approach and endeavor.

**Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

The stakeholders are the staff, students, and families of Dave Thomas Education Center and Charles Drew Family Resource Center. By functioning as a team, the staff works tirelessly to connect with students and parents. The common adage of a team is that together everyone achieves more. The PBIS model serves as a guide for the role of the staff to promote a positive culture and environment.

**Part V: Budget**

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

| 1  | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups |  |                          |     | \$1,500.00        |
|--|----------|--|--|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
|  | Function | Object   | Budget Focus                             | Funding Source           | FTE | 2021-22           |
|  |          |  | 3651 - Dave Thomas Education Center West | School Improvement Funds |     | \$1,500.00        |
| Notes: \$1,500.00 for USA Test Prep program. |          |  |  |                          |     |                   |
| <b>Total:</b>                                |          |  |  |                          |     | <b>\$1,500.00</b> |