Branford High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Branford High School

405 REYNOLDS ST NE, Branford, FL 32008

bhs.suwannee.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Terry Huddleston

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2020-21 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Suwannee 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

Branford High School

405 REYNOLDS ST NE, Branford, FL 32008

bhs.suwannee.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	80%

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

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Suwannee 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.

Branford High School will educate all students in a safe and supportive learning environment that will develop life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Branford High School will be a system of excellence ensuring all students are prepared for personal success.

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
Huddleston, Terry	Principal	School Principal
Marshall, Audrey	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal/Curriculum Coordinator
Braun, Michael	Dean	Dean of Discipline
Poole, Alicia	School Counselor	Guidance
Harrell, Leah	School Counselor	Guidance
Jackson, Monica	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Terry Huddleston

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.*
1

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

735

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

5

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

5

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	102	118	121	120	91	92	84	728
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	29	41	33	30	19	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	9	1	3	1	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	17	3	9	24	7	5	92
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	8	17	20	12	15	7	101
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	20	36	31	30	21	24	185
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	23	28	31	13	11	18	162
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	51	45	29	32	36	34	269

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	34	25	25	30	31	21	14	180

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	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	109	101	94	89	86	91	677
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	43	43	27	31	22	22	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	10	2	2	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	22	11	4	6	5	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	22	23	25	20	13	17	133
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	21	14	14	13	19	8	112
	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	25	26	23	20	13	11	135

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	109	101	94	89	86	91	677
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	43	43	27	31	22	22	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	10	2	2	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	22	11	4	6	5	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	22	23	25	20	13	17	133
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	21	14	14	13	19	8	112
	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	17	25	26	23	20	13	11	135

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	1	1	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3

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				53%	50%	56%	46%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	49%	51%	40%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	42%	42%	30%	35%	44%
Math Achievement				55%	46%	51%	48%	39%	51%
Math Learning Gains				57%	43%	48%	49%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	41%	45%	38%	39%	45%
Science Achievement				64%	63%	68%	54%	68%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				64%	63%	73%	65%	66%	71%

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	58%	46%	12%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	46%	42%	4%	52%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
09	2021					
	2019	52%	47%	5%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2021					
	2019	46%	51%	-5%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	64%	45%	19%	55%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	67%	50%	17%	54%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
08	2021					
	2019	29%	30%	-1%	46%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	54%	52%	2%	48%	6%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	73%	66%	7%	67%	6%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	64%	68%	-4%	71%	-7%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	60%	64%	-4%	70%	-10%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	38%	44%	-6%	61%	-23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	59%	2%	57%	4%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady: ELA Grades 6-8, Math Grades 6-8
STAR: ELA Grades 9-12, Algebra 1, Geometry
District Assessments: Science, Social Studies

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60%	71%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	36%	46%	40%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69%	82%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	45%	57%	75%
	English Language Learners	0	0	33%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48%	47%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	24%	29%	40%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63%	67%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	41%	45%	51%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56%	28%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	15%	10%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49%	18%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	7%	6%	25%
	English Language Learners	100%	0%	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	36%	31%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	34%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	25	42	29	30	44	46	43	33		88	27
ELL	29	47		35	53						
BLK				20	50						
HSP	51	47	47	50	50	42	50	48		90	
MUL	50	58		55	71			50			

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
WHT	52	50	41	56	50	46	58	68	55	99	68
FRL	42	43	42	48	50	42	48	53	32	100	56

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	30	44	30	31	41	22	40	41		100	10
ELL	30	40		45							
BLK	25	58		31	38						
HSP	48	53	64	63	60		58	44	63		
MUL	62	69		58	42						
WHT	54	54	35	55	58	48	67	66	75	97	80
FRL	47	52	37	51	54	42	57	53	56	98	68

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	33	22	21	39	42	25	33			
ELL	29	62		33	58						
BLK	31	42		27	50		10				
HSP	42	46	33	52	56	60	38	77			
MUL	30	30									
WHT	47	40	29	48	48	34	60	64	71	97	79
FRL	43	40	33	46	47	38	50	59	66	94	62

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	58
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	637
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Based on FSA data, 6th grade math and ELA scores continued to increase. African American students continue to be an underperforming group. There are also significant gaps in achievement between white and Hispanic students. ELA scores continue to lag behind state averages.

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

Progress monitoring data and 2019 state assessments indicate the greatest need for improvement is the rate of academic growth and proficiency in ELA among all grade levels and all subgroups, particularly African Americans, ELL students, and students with disabilities.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement include the percentage of students scoring at level 2 or lower on state assessments as well as the number of students requiring intervention or urgent intervention on progress monitoring assessments. More frequent professional development in instructional strategies and data analysis will be utilized to drive improvement in ELA performance.

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

8th grade math performance showed the greatest increase on the 2019 state assessment and on progress monitoring data.

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

Contributing factors to the improvement of 8th grade math performance include greater data analysis used to drive instructional adjustments. New actions the school took that contributed to this improvement was a greater focus on the utilization of PLC time to increase collaboration among teachers.

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

New strategies that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning are a deeper analysis of progress monitoring and state data that is used to drive instructional decisions and an increase in interventions provided to low-performing students.

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.

Quarterly professional development will be provided to teachers that will introduce or re-teach effective instructional practices and strategies. Additionally, strategies to support ELL students will be shared and discussed with teachers. Finally, differentiation will be utilized to address students' individual learning needs.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability include the increased communication between ESE facilitators and general education teachers to enhance student learning; the addition of an ELL para to school staff to facilitate learning of ELL students, increased professional development among math instructors to implement and prepare students for achievement of new standards, and the addition of an academic coach.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2020-2021 9th grade cohort dropped to 43% proficient in ELA on the 2021 FSA. That group of students has historically scored as high as 52% proficient in the past. Only 43% of the LQ in ELA made learning gains. BHS will target the lowest quartile for 2021-2022 for significant improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	10th Grade ELA Proficiency will increase to 52%. 48% of students in the lowest quartile for ELA will make learning gains on the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Students' progress will be monitored using i-Ready and the STAR English Progress Monitoring assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Jackson (monica.jackson@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize the strategies as written in the SCSD K12 Reading Plan. Tiered instruction and interventions will take place as prescribed by the FDOE approved plan.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	BHS will target the 2021 7th grade cohort for mathematics improvement. This group of students scored 62% proficient on the 2021 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	7th Grade math cohort will score at least 67% proficient on the 2022 FSA. 51% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains in mathematics on the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	The math teachers and school administration will monitor the progress of math students utilizing the i-Ready and STAR progress monitoring assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terry Huddleston (terry.huddleston@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Identification and tiered interventions in mathematics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In examining the 2019 results, the Black/African-American subgroup showed the following: ELA Proficiency - 25% ELA Learning Gains - 58% Math Proficiency - 31% Math Learning Gains - 38% All other cells did not have enough data for a calculation to be published. Based on this data, three of the four cells indicate a need for a special goal related to the Black/African American subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	The Black/African American subgroup will improve to the following levels on the 2022 FSA: ELA Proficiency - 30% ELA Learning Gains - 63% Math Proficiency - 36% Math Learning Gains - 42% If each component is able to be raised by 5%, the overall African American subgroup average will be 42%.
Monitoring:	School administration, guidance counselors, and the new academic coach will work with teachers to identify the students in need in this subgroup. Tiered interventions will be utilized based upon those written in the SCSD K12 Reading Plan and the SCSD Math Intervention Plan. Students will participate in the school's progress monitoring assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terry Huddleston (terry.huddleston@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In examining the 2019 results, the SWD subgroup showed the following: ELA Proficiency - 30% ELA Learning Gains - 44% ELA LQ Learning Gains - 30% Math Proficiency - 31% Math Learning Gains - 38% Math LQ Learning Gains - 22% Social Studies - 41% Science - 40% Graduation - 100% College/Career Acceleration - 10% The middle school acceleration cell did not have enough data for a calculation to be published. Based on this data, three of the seven cells indicate a need for a special goal related to the SWD subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	The SWD subgroup will improve to the following levels on the 2022 FSA: ELA Proficiency - 35% ELA Learning Gains - 49% ELA LQ Learning Gains - 35% Math Proficiency - 36% Math Learning Gains - 43% Math LQ Learning Gains - 27% Social Studies - 46% Science - 45% Graduation - 100% College/Career Acceleration - 15% If each component is able to be raised by 5%, the overall SWD subgroup average will be 43%. School administration, guidance counselors, and the new academic coach will work with teachers to identify the students in need in this subgroup. Tiered interventions will be utilized based upon those written in the SCSD K12 Reading Plan and the SCSD Math Intervention Plan. Students will participate in the school's progress monitoring assessments.
Monitoring:	The District Coordinator of ESE will work with BHS Support Facilitators and paraprofessionals on classroom strategies to better support students in the inclusion classroom. (BPIE document) BHS Administration and District ESE Coordinator will assist self-contained teachers in monitoring progress of students in the self-contained classrooms toward improvement on the FSAA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terry Huddleston (terry.huddleston@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In examining the 2019 results, the ELL subgroup showed the following: ELA Proficiency - 30% ELA Learning Gains - 40% Math Proficiency - 45% Based on this data, two of the three cells indicate a need for a special goal related to the ELL subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	The ELL subgroup will improve to the following levels on the 2022 FSA: ELA Proficiency - 35% ELA Learning Gains - 45% Math Proficiency - 50% If each component is able to be raised by 5%, the overall African American subgroup average will be 43%.
Monitoring:	School administration, guidance counselors, and the new academic coach will work with teachers to identify the students in need in this subgroup. Tiered interventions will be utilized based upon those written in the SCSD K12 Reading Plan and the SCSD Math Intervention Plan. Students will participate in the school's progress monitoring assessments. The District ELL Coordinator will work with BHS ELL paraprofessionals on classroom strategies to better support students in the inclusion classroom. BHS Administration and District Coordinator will assist teachers in monitoring progress of ELL students in the classrooms toward improvement on the Access for ELLs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terry Huddleston (terry.huddleston@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

A review of the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org indicates Branford High School scored Low twice and Very Low on the School Incident Tracking Report. BHS reported 1.7 incidents per 100 students. The Statewide rate was 3.3 incidents per 100 students.
Even though BHS scored well below the state average on the
School Incident Tracking Report, the safety of students, teachers, staff and parents must remain the top priority of the Administration. Administration was reorganized this year to include a Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean of Students, an additional Guidance Counselor for a total of two and a new SRO. One counselor will serve 6-8 grade students and the other counselor will serve 9-12 students. The additional counselor is a tremendous help when dealing with middle school students. Most referrals involve middle school students which requires additional time and effort. A Meridian counselor is available to students 3 days a week.
All students will participate in the required Mental Health Training during the first nine weeks. Early Warning Students (EWS) are identified and meet with their appropriate counselor.

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.

The administration, teachers, faculty and staff strive to provide an educational environment where students feel safe and student learning is the focus of each day. The addition of a middle school counselor and a Dean of Students has provided additional staff to focus on the individual needs of students. Everyone has an open door policy where students are encouraged to seek help in a time of need.
Numerous club and athletic teams are available for student participation. This year Esports and a new STEM class were started specifically for 7th and 8th graders that showed a strong interest in technology. CTE programs include Welding, Culinary Arts , Agriculture 6-12 and Journalism. Additional electives include Band, Art, Spanish, Dual Enrollment and AP.

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

Branford High School is the centerpiece of Branford, Florida, a small, rural agricultural town situated by the Suwannee River in north central Florida. Virtually everyone knows each other and generations have attended BHS. Activities at the school become a community affair and activities sponsored by the City of

Branford become a school affair. Multiple stakeholders contribute to BHS both financially and with their time. The Agriculture program is responsible for many interactions between the community and the school. This year a new metal building was donated to the program, a center pivot system was donated, Farm Day brought in approximately 20 agriculture-related businesses, Halloween and Christmas decoration contests are sponsored by the program and the Suwannee County Fair provides many opportunities for the community and school to work together.

Athletics is definitely a community event, be it a BHS football game on Friday night or youth football on Saturdays. Baseball, volleyball, softball, weightlifting, and track are well attended by the community. Both baseball and softball are making improvements to their respective fields with 100% support from parents and local businesses.