

Broward County Public Schools

Deerfield Beach High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 26 |

Deerfield Beach High School

910 SW 15TH ST, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jon Marlow

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2007

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 95% |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 26 |

Deerfield Beach High School

910 SW 15TH ST, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441

[no web address on file]

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 9-12 | No | 66% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 86% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | C | C | C |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Deerfield Beach High School is to provide our students the best education in a safe and positive environment, conducive to their social, emotional, and academic growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We the administration, faculty & staff of Deerfield Beach High School, believe that educating students is teaching students how to learn. In providing students with thinking and learning skills, we enable them to become productive, self-sufficient, and responsible citizens. Deerfield Beach High School is fortunate to have students diverse in ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds. We believe that composition of our student body provides an excellent resource to teach an appreciation for differences of people within a spirit of cooperation.

We believe that education must address the “whole person”, that the social, intellectual, and physical needs can not be separated. This holistic approach to education results in an integrated curriculum rich knowledge and experiences.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Marlow, Jon | Principal | Mr. Jon Marlow has been the principal of Deerfield Beach High School for 14 years. As the leader of the school, he supervises all Assistant Principals, Teachers, Support Personnel, and Facility Personnel. He is responsible for overall School Achievement, plans, and goals. He represents the school in the community. He provides instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school. Mr. Marlow prepares and manages the school's budget. He is responsible for the management and inventory of school's assets. He reads, interprets, follows and enforces the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and other state and federal laws. He interviews, coaches and evaluates school based personnel. He also enforces all collective bargaining agreements. |
| Delance, Miderland | Assistant Principal | Projected Budget, Scheduling and curriculum, Team Leader Meetings, SAC/SAF Meetings, Department Head Elections, Exam Exemption and Schedule, Interim Reports and Report Cards, Industry Certification, District and State Reports, Departmental and Textbook Orders, TDAs, Boundaries, Perkins Grant, Parent Link, Language Arts Plan, Writing Plan, Guidance Plan, ESOL Plan, ELA Scores, College Readiness Scores, Evaluations for Language Arts, ESOL and ESOL Paras, Guidance and the Budgetkeeper |
| Roberson, Keith | Assistant Principal | Discipline for students G-N, Transportation, Inventory, Designee for all Security and Lockdown Procedures, Student IDs, Portable Report, Facilities and Work Orders, Custodial Supervision, Records Retention, Cafeteria/Pool, Clinic and Medication, Investigation Designee, Anti Bullying Prevention Liaison, Security and Safety, Orientations, Safety/Emergency Procedures/Drills, Keys/Parking and Lockers, Saturday Tutoring, EL0, Critical Incidence, 21st Century Grant, RISE (Internal Suspension Program), Social Studies Plan, SMART Bond, American History Scores, Evaluation for: Social Studies, Foreign Language, Security, and Custodians. |
| Smith, Gwen | Assistant Principal | Discipline for students A-F, Graduation Plan, Graduation Rate, Detentions/Daily Schedules, Free and Reduced Lunch, Grants, Black History Activities, Monthly Celebrations, Newsletter, Bucks Bulletin, PIO Programs and Responsibilities, School Marketing, CWT Meetings, Student Insurance, Accident Reports, Code of Conduct, Emergency Cards, Teacher Online Handbook, Opening Week Procedures, First Day Procedures, Media Center, Open House, NESS, Investing in Women of the Future Evaluations for: ROTC/PE/Band/Art/Drama, Vocational/Business, Media Specialist |
| Deese, Chelsie | Assistant Principal | A.P. for Math, Staff Appreciation, and Student Activities, discipline for students O-Z, Secretaries and Student Affairs, Special Events, Staff Appreciation, Science Plan, ESE Plan, Biology Scores, RTI/Child Study, RTI Database & Plan, Discipline Plan, Discipline Committee, Testing Schedule, Testing Coordinator, PERT Testing, Student Activities: Master Calendar/Contracts/Bids/Leases/Sponsor Handbook/Pep Rallies/Assemblies/Field Trips/Guest Speakers Approvals/Daily Announcements/Marquee/Homecoming/Prom, Multicultural Activities, AP Duty Roster, Grad Bash Supervision, EEO Liaison/Sexual Health |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---|
| | | Initiative Grant, Attendance, Child Study Administrator Representative - Delegates to appropriate APs, Evaluations for: Science, ESE and ESE Paras, Bookkeeper, Secretaries |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2007, Jon Marlow

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.*

2

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

103

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,321

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

9

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 632 | 563 | 611 | 515 | 2321 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 173 | 169 | 131 | 654 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 43 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 60 | 46 | 48 | 193 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 162 | 170 | 0 | 372 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 96 | 103 | 1 | 309 |

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 | 96 | 47 | 35 | 68 | 246 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 28 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/27/2021

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 | 0 | 0 | 564 | 685 | 566 | 560 | 2375 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 164 | 128 | 125 | 561 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 212 | 191 | 160 | 749 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 157 | 175 | 140 | 644 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 23 |

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 | 51 | 43 | 65 | 56 | 215 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 18 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 564 | 685 | 566 | 560 | 2375 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 164 | 128 | 125 | 561 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 212 | 191 | 160 | 749 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 157 | 175 | 140 | 644 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 23 |

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 | 51 | 43 | 65 | 56 | 215 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 18 |

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 | | | | 41% | 57% | 56% | 45% | 58% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 44% | 52% | 51% | 48% | 54% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 31% | 45% | 42% | 33% | 47% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 32% | 51% | 51% | 36% | 49% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 38% | 44% | 48% | 39% | 45% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 29% | 43% | 45% | 36% | 46% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 54% | 66% | 68% | 52% | 64% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 59% | 71% | 73% | 61% | 70% | 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 |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 57% | -17% | 55% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 53% | -15% | 53% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 53% | 67% | -14% | 67% | -14% |
| 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 | 56% | 67% | -11% | 70% | -14% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 25% | 61% | -36% | 61% | -36% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 37% | 56% | -19% | 57% | -20% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), iLit. It was a challenge to get accurate progress monitoring data due to the pandemic. FSA subgroup data was used to create the analysis and plan in the absence of accurate progress monitoring data.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | 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 | | | |
| | 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 | | | |
| | 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | 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 | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | 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 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 6 | 20 | 32 | 25 | 26 | | 97 | 63 |
| ELL | 15 | 28 | 24 | 8 | 17 | 30 | 22 | 12 | | 98 | 84 |
| ASN | 83 | 73 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 30 | 22 | 7 | 13 | 28 | 22 | 29 | | 98 | 85 |
| HSP | 39 | 39 | 25 | 14 | 19 | 38 | 34 | 37 | | 99 | 85 |

| 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 |
| MUL | 50 | 36 | | 15 | 23 | | | | | 100 | 85 |
| WHT | 59 | 48 | 14 | 31 | 16 | | 45 | 54 | | 100 | 90 |
| FRL | 33 | 31 | 24 | 11 | 15 | 31 | 24 | 35 | | 98 | 84 |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 18 | 36 | 34 | 11 | 26 | 24 | 30 | 38 | | 90 | 65 |
| ELL | 17 | 35 | 28 | 23 | 37 | 28 | 36 | 35 | | 85 | 79 |
| ASN | 95 | 68 | | 75 | 60 | | 85 | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 39 | 31 | 23 | 33 | 23 | 47 | 50 | | 94 | 81 |
| HSP | 38 | 39 | 28 | 35 | 43 | 43 | 57 | 65 | | 93 | 90 |
| MUL | 56 | 50 | | 29 | | | | 73 | | 94 | 100 |
| WHT | 71 | 59 | 42 | 59 | 43 | | 71 | 75 | | 95 | 89 |
| FRL | 33 | 40 | 33 | 28 | 36 | 28 | 51 | 56 | | 93 | 84 |
| 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 | 17 | 22 | 11 | 15 | 21 | 13 | 31 | 35 | | 80 | 77 |
| ELL | 14 | 38 | 30 | 20 | 40 | 36 | 22 | 24 | | 76 | 72 |
| ASN | 93 | 54 | | 80 | | | | 100 | | 100 | 100 |
| BLK | 35 | 44 | 34 | 27 | 33 | 33 | 45 | 50 | | 92 | 85 |
| HSP | 46 | 50 | 33 | 40 | 48 | 42 | 58 | 63 | | 90 | 87 |
| MUL | 64 | 73 | | 41 | | | 55 | 73 | | 72 | 89 |
| WHT | 66 | 55 | 22 | 51 | 38 | 42 | 68 | 81 | | 90 | 91 |
| FRL | 41 | 46 | 32 | 32 | 39 | 35 | 51 | 55 | | 89 | 86 |

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 | 40 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 39 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 444 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 70% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| 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 | 34 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 78 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 37 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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?

Trends emerging from 3-Year FSA and EOC assessment data:

ELA (9/10) combined 2018 (45), 2019 (41), 2021 (38)

Math 2018 (36), 2019 (32), 2021 (12)

ELA Learning Gains 2018 (48), 2019 (44), 2021 (36)

Math Learning Gains 2018 (39), 2019 (38), 2021 (15)

ELA Lowest 25% 2018 (33), 2019 (31), 2021 (23)

Math Lowest 25% 2018 (36), 2019 (29), 2021 (31)

Science 2018 (52), 2019 (54), 2021 (30)

Social Science 2018 (61), 2019 (59), 2021 (35)

All core content areas, subgroups, and combined grade levels decreased significantly (>20 points) in 2021 with the exception of a 2-point increase in the Math Lowest 25% subgroup. Note: Florida state assessments were suspended in 2020.

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

Based on the 2019 state assessments, the greatest need for improvement is with our Student with Disabilities, and our lowest quartile students in both ELA and Math. The majority of our lowest quartile students are our English Language Learners 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?

A global contributing factor last year was the Pandemic. Many students and teachers had to get acclimated to a new method of teaching and learning. Students who struggle with Reading often need a differentiated approach to instruction that addresses foundational skills, rather its with Math, Science, or English. With math, oftentimes, many students need one-on-one tutoring to address weak math foundational skills that prevent them from accessing higher level skills to be successful in Algebra or Geometry. This year we are addressing differentiation in Reading by incorporating the System 44 program for Reading fundamental skills like phonological awareness, phonics, decoding, and encoding. We are using the Read 180 program for students who are struggling with vocabulary and comprehension skills. We have an ESSA teacher who will work with our aspiring readers by pushing into our Intensive Reading classes. As for math, through Professional Learning Communities, the focus is on acquiring pre-requisite skills needed to work on grade level content and progress monitoring.

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

As progress monitoring was difficult to complete during the Pandemic and the validity of the data collected was questionable, it is difficult to ascertain areas of improvement. We will use embedded monitoring tools during AP1 and AP2 to show progress and areas of concern.

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

We will provide "re-engagement" activities such as tutoring and curriculum upgrades to accelerate learning and achievement.

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

Re-engaging students in the learning process by providing diagnostic assessments to identify learning loss and pre-requisite skills needed to accelerate learning. Some of the strategies will include learning centers in reading, technology integration in core academic courses and research-based instructional practices in all courses to engage learners in real-work application of content.

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.

Professional leaning will focus on instructional strategies needed to accelerate learning: Student re-engagement, learning stations, increasing rigor and using technology to enhance learning.

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

The school will offer extended learning opportunities in core subjects to help student acquire pre-requisite skills needed to accelerate learning in core classes. Students will have opportunities to get additional support after school and on Saturdays. Additional support will also be made available during winter and spring breaks.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | As the school's ELA Learning Gains in our Lowest Quartile went from 33% to 31% in 2019 and our school's overall Reading Proficiency is only 36%, These percentages are far lower than the District's average for these particular categories. As our students in the lowest quartile contains our most vulnerable groups such as free and reduced lunch, Black and Hispanic Students and SWD, this is an area that we seek to improve. |
| Measurable Outcome: | As evidenced by the 2022 FSA, Improve Learning Gains in ELA from the 2019 of 31% to 36% for our Lowest 25%. |
| Monitoring: | DBHS will use progress monitoring tools such as the embedded Intro to Lit Pre-test, Mid-test, and Post-test for all Tier 1, 2, and Tier 3 students. In addition, our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will be monitored with the Reading Inventory Test three times a year. Tier 3 will be monitored three times a year with the Phonics Inventory. Administrators will conduct regular Classroom Walkthroughs to ensure that all literacy programs are implemented with fidelity. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Charlotte Jackson (charlotte.jackson@browardschools.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Deerfield Beach High School is implementing the District's screened and adopted Intro to Literature, iLit ELL, System 44, and READ 180 programs, curriculum, and strategies for our students. This differentiated approach to literacy will assist our teachers with providing highly engaging, culturally diverse, yet age appropriate instruction for all students. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | As our school's Reading Proficiency rate is only 36%, and our ELL and SWD students are struggling with reading, we needed a differentiated approach for literacy |

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure that all ELA, DLA, and Reading teachers are trained on the new adopted materials.

Person Responsible Miderland Delance (miderland.delance@browardschools.com)

Ensure that all monitoring is completed with fidelity.

Person Responsible Charlotte Jackson (charlotte.jackson@browardschools.com)

Conduct Classroom Walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Gwen Smith (gwen.smithclark@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2019, our school's Math proficiency in the lower 25% quartile decreased from 36% to 29%. As this percentage is below the district and state's average and our Black and Hispanic and SWD are vastly affected, this is an area that we will focus our efforts on. Our 2020 FSA scores report that our Algebra proficiency rate was 11% and our Geometry was 13%, which confirms this as an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome: As evidenced by the 2022 FSA, Improve Learning Gains from 2019 in Math from 29% to 34% for our Lowest 25%.

Monitoring: Common Assessments and Classroom Walkthroughs will be used to monitor the outcome

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Chelsie Deese (chelsie.deese@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common assessments and PLC focused on student achievement will be at the core for improving our students' performance in math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Common assessments developed in PLCs are proven methods from improving teacher and student performance. This method was selected due to the necessity of developing a method of assessing student needs and progress monitoring and management of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure that PLC are conducted and are productive.

Person Responsible Chelsie Deese (chelsie.deese@browardschools.com)

Ensure that Common Assessments are developed, administered, and results are analyzed.

Person Responsible Chelsie Deese (chelsie.deese@browardschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | We have failed to meet proficiency with our ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities at 37%. Our SWD students are well below the District and State Averages in Mathematics . |
| Measurable Outcome: | As evidenced by the 2022 FSA ELA and Mathematics test scores, our SWD students will increase in Mathematics from 26% to 31% and our ESSA rating will increase from 37% to 41%. |
| Monitoring: | Common Assessments and Classroom Walkthroughs. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Chelsie Deese (chelsie.deese@browardschools.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | We choose will continue to provide an Instructional Facilitator with a Mathematics Background. By providing students with mathematics support from a Mathematics teacher with a dual certification in ESE, we will be providing our students with extra support in addition to other ESE strategies provided by their regular math instructor. The Assistant Principal has a Math Background and will be able to better monitor the achievement of our SWD students. Differentiated Learning through Learning Stations, Hands on Math, and Real-World Problem solving will also allow equitable access to the mathematics standards and curriculum. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Our SWD students FSA scores in Mathematics are far below the District and State averages. Our SWD students require differentiated instruction and additional support in order to access the curriculum and the standards. By providing the above mentioned strategies, we are confident that our SWD students will improve there ESSE rating in 2019 from 37 to 41, and Learning Gains from 26% to 31%. |

Action Steps to Implement

Monitoring of Common Assessment Data and Remediation Plan.

Person Responsible Chelsie Deese (chelsie.deese@browardschools.com)

Monitoring of classroom support and assistance for mainstreamed students.

Person Responsible Chelsie Deese (chelsie.deese@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.

In a comparison of the Deerfield Beach High School's (DBHS) rate of incidence to the state's average per 100 students, it is reported that DBHS rate is 1.77 and the states average was 1.16. Our average is considered high and it is an area of concern. As for Drug Related incidences, DBHS reports as 1.05 and the states average was 2.06, while DBHS average is considered low, we will continue to monitor it. Our property Damage Incidents per 100 students is reported to be 0.04 while the state's average is 0.06. The Property Damage Incidents for our school is considered to be "Middle" and again we will monitor it .

To combat critical incidence at DBHS, we will use our School-Wide Positive Behavior Plan (SPBP) and continue with required instruction in mental health and implement district-wide Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Initiatives. Our teachers will be in-serviced on the SPBP, required mental training and SEL curriculum and will teach lessons given in the plan to support positive behavior and interactions among students and adults. Our teachers and school counselors will also engage in SEL lessons with our students during study hall. Daily Mindfulness activities will be delivered in the morning and throughout the school day. School counselors will provide resources and strategies to students to help deescalate negative behavior.

Our strategy for Drug Related Incidents is to provide our students, community, and teachers with required substance abuse curriculum and resources to combat substance abuse related issues. We will monitor any activities that suggest drug use or substance abuse and take immediate action based on district policy and discipline matrix We have increased our campus security and have added an extra School Resource Officer to ensure that students and staff have a safe environment to engage in learning.

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.

At Deerfield Beach High school, we pride ourselves on our positive school culture. Our healthy cultural climate is due to strong relationship building. We build and maintain effective relationships among the staff, students, parents, and the community. We have a tradition within the community of being a hub, a

cornerstone, and an inspiration for the entire city of Deerfield Beach.

We foster relationships among our staff by providing activities and opportunities for administrators, teachers, support staff, custodians to engage with each other. Our principal, Mr. Jon Marlow, has an open-door policy and encourages input from all staff. He leads the school by setting high expectations and supporting each staff member by promoting professional learning. Mrs. Chelsie Deese, the administrator over hospitality, fosters good will by hosting events such as Staff Appreciation Day, Thanksgiving and Winter Holiday luncheons. There are even opportunities for the entire staff to gather for off-site activities.

As we have a diverse student population, there are a plethora of clubs and activities available to meet the various needs of our students. For example, Latinos in Action, Upbound, College Tour, and the Gay, Straight, Alliance clubs are just a few of the clubs that are available to our students. Our teachers plan standards-based culturally relevant lessons that not only educate but engage. Our Equity Liaison, Mrs. Gidgette Augustin promotes monthly cultural activities and gives resources to celebrate events like National Hispanic Month, Women's History Month and Black History Month.

We meet monthly with our parents, business leaders, and all other stakeholders at our School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings and School Advisory Council (SAF). In addition to assisting with the School Improvement Plan, the SAC meetings provide all stakeholders with an opportunity to be informed on the happenings of our school, to voice concerns, provide solutions, to inquire, and to make suggestions directly to our administrative staff.

We pride ourselves on our relationships within the community. We have created and maintained alliances with companies and government agencies such as the JM Family and the Deerfield Beach Chambers of Commerce. Our partnerships with local businesses have provided our staff and students with numerous donations like sanitizers, school supplies, and discounts.

We will continue to work hard with all stakeholders to ensure the most positive, safe, and culturally accepting school climate possible.

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

District- Provide school with resources and support

Administration- Create an environment that is conducive to learning

Staff- implement strategies that promotes a positive culture of learning and growth

Students- engaging learning and take part in promoting a positive school culture

Parents- Support school initiatives and programs to promote positive school culture

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|---|----------------|-----|------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$6,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 1711 - Deerfield Beach High School | General Fund | | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Funds will be used to provide extended learning opportunities in ELA and Test Preparation. | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$6,000.00 |

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
|---------------|---------------|--|---|--------------------------|-----|--------------------|
| | | | 1711 - Deerfield Beach High School | School Improvement Funds | | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Funds will be used to provide ongoing supplemental tutoring after school, Saturdays, winter and spring break to ensure students have necessary pre-requisite skills to accelerate learning in math courses.</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$6,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 1711 - Deerfield Beach High School | School Improvement Funds | | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Funds will be used to provide ongoing supplemental tutoring after school, Saturdays, winter and spring break to ensure students have necessary pre-requisite skills to accelerate learning in core academic subjects.</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$18,000.00 |