

Broward County Public Schools

Plantation 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	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Plantation High School

6901 NW 16TH ST, Plantation, FL 33313

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Parinaz Bristol

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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)	91%
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 (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Plantation High School

6901 NW 16TH ST, Plantation, FL 33313

[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	93%

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 Plantation High School is to meet the needs of all its students by providing an education balanced by academic excellence, career pathways, community service and extracurricular activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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
Bristol , Parinaz	Principal	Supervise and manage all aspects of the school.
Gayle, Nichola	Assistant Principal	Supervises the English, IB, Cambridge Departments and is the admin over 11th grade
Major, Horatio	Assistant Principal	Supervises the Math and Science Departments and is the admin over 10th grade
Rios, Sylvia	Assistant Principal	Supervises the World Language and CTE Departments and is the admin over 12th grad

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Parinaz Bristol

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

85

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,989

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

12

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

13

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	541	549	470	427	1987	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	162	134	119	546	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	8	1	32	
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	18	38	33	143	232	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	185	122	0	330	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	35	0	95	

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	83	113	75	0	271

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	1	1	3	19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/29/2021

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	0	504	494	447	475	1920
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	107	80	87	392
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	153	136	96	521
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	116	106	91	418
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	150	149	135	601
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	150	84	87	507

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	0	27	

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	53	51	38	53	195	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	14	

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	0	504	494	447	475	1920
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	107	80	87	392
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	153	136	96	521
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	116	106	91	418
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	150	149	135	601
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	150	84	87	507

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	0	27	

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	53	51	38	53	195
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	14

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				40%	57%	56%	37%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	52%	51%	47%	54%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	45%	42%	44%	47%	44%
Math Achievement				31%	51%	51%	31%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains				31%	44%	48%	40%	45%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	43%	45%	44%	46%	45%
Science Achievement				56%	66%	68%	55%	64%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				54%	71%	73%	51%	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	43%	57%	-14%	55%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	33%	53%	-20%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

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	55%	67%	-12%	67%	-12%
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	52%	67%	-15%	70%	-18%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	24%	61%	-37%	61%	-37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	34%	56%	-22%	57%	-23%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

FSA Spring '21 data -grades 9 and 10

FAIR - grades 9 and 10

Retakes - grades 11 and 12

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44		35
	Economically Disadvantaged	42		
	Students With Disabilities	20		
	English Language Learners	13		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31		11
	Economically Disadvantaged	29		
	Students With Disabilities	25		
	English Language Learners	28		
	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			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35		35
	Economically Disadvantaged	31		
	Students With Disabilities	20		
	English Language Learners	18		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31		11
	Economically Disadvantaged	29		
	Students With Disabilities	25		
	English Language Learners	28		
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56		37
	Economically Disadvantaged	55		
	Students With Disabilities	33		
	English Language Learners	31		
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	54		48
	Economically Disadvantaged	50		
	Students With Disabilities	43		
	English Language Learners	35		

Grade 12				
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			

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	21	32	31	16	22	24	26	42		93	32
ELL	20	31	33	5	17	29	34	36		98	53
ASN	68	63								100	86
BLK	31	36	32	13	20	31	34	47		97	54
HSP	40	42	29	13	16	25	49	59		89	69

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	53	56		27	21			50		100	76
WHT	63	50		32	17		74	59		93	68
FRL	32	37	30	13	18	29	34	48		96	57
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	21	25	23	24	40	41	35	43		95	31
ELL	25	38	42	30	36	43	45	43		85	59
ASN	63	43		36				80		100	68
BLK	34	41	33	27	30	29	50	53		94	60
HSP	47	48	50	38	38	40	65	54		90	65
MUL	57	44		41	20		64	53			
WHT	70	59		54	30		88	63		93	68
FRL	37	42	35	29	32	30	55	50		93	61
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	26	45	39	31	44	46	33	32		74	43
ELL	15	41	49	22	47	33	30	17		78	50
ASN	52	68		46			55	76		88	52
BLK	34	45	42	28	39	44	52	44		94	42
HSP	43	50	53	33	44	45	62	63		92	58
MUL	53	58		41	22		71	30		100	69
WHT	51	43		51	55		79	84		90	60
FRL	35	46	44	29	39	43	53	47		92	45

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	86%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	36
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	79
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	38
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	43
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	55
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	57
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?

Students declined in mathematics. The learning gains across all all content areas among subgroups declined.

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

Mathematics achievement showed the lowest performance. The data remained the same from the previous year. Students showed no improvement from year to year.

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

Student learning gaps from previous years contributed to the lack of improvement from year to year. Also, under-performing students with disabilities, minimal teacher collaboration, and teacher in depth data analysis to be used to drive instruction.

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

ELA and Social Studies Achievement showed the most improvement.

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

Both ELA and Social Studies work collaboratively with each other. A literacy school-wide initiative was implemented across all content areas. Data analysis played a role in teacher making informed decisions for instruction.

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

Students in all achievement levels will receive secondary ELA and Mathematics instructional support via small group pullouts and curriculum support from academic coaches.

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.

District curriculum facilitators will provide monthly professional development to ELA and Mathematics teachers within their professional learning communities.

Curriculum coaches will provide weekly professional development based on targeted areas of deficiencies for students.

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

Continuous support for students via data analysis and ongoing professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Improve Math achievement and learning gains. All areas lost 20 percentage points when compared to the previous year. Students will make gains towards proficiency in their grade level

Measurable Outcome: Math achievement will increase from 14% to 40%

Monitoring: Students will complete formative assessments within Mastery Connect and teachers will use the data to drive instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Horatio Major (horatio.major@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strategies being used include formative assessments based on standards taught. Implementation of a math lab and pullout groups allows for students needs to be addressed in a small group setting. In addition, Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers are working collaboratively to address the needs of the students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The math students were lacking the practical hands on experience with math and the real world application of math standards and strategies. Also, the amount of learning gaps called for a more individualized approach with students.

Action Steps to Implement

Math Instructional Leader support for teachers and students

Person Responsible Horatio Major (horatio.major@browardschools.com)

Progress Monitoring via formative assessments

Person Responsible Horatio Major (horatio.major@browardschools.com)

Math Pullout Groups

Person Responsible Horatio Major (horatio.major@browardschools.com)

Math support in the after-school program

Person Responsible Horatio Major (horatio.major@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve ELA Achievement levels. Students will increase proficiency in their grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA achievement will increase from 35% to 45%
Monitoring:	Students, teachers, and administrators will discuss data within quarterly data chats. Formative assessment data will be disaggregated on a continuous basis.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies being used include formative assessments based on standards taught. In addition, cornell-note taking and annotation as school-wide literacy initiatives in all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies were selected because it allows for students to learn how to close read text and further their understanding of the text.

Action Steps to Implement

Literacy Coach support for teachers and students

Person Responsible Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)

Progress Monitoring via formative assessments

Person Responsible Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)

Monitoring the implementation of the school-wide initiative

Person Responsible Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)

ELA Pullout Groups

Person Responsible Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)

ELA support in the after-school program

Person Responsible Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with disabilities was the only subgroup which did not score at least a 41% on the ESSA Federal Index.

Measurable Outcome: Students with disabilities ESSA Federal will increase from 38% to 42%

Monitoring: Collaborative meeting with the ESE Specialist, ESE Support Facilitators, Curriculum Coaches

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities will receive additional support in their Learning Strategies class. ESE support facilitators will work collaboratively with mainly ELA and Math teachers during PLCs and implement learned strategies in their classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities have varying reason why they need additional support according to their IEPs and the best way to address those needs are to incorporate prescribed accommodations in and out of the general classroom setting.

Action Steps to Implement

Literacy Coach support for teachers and students

Person Responsible Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)

Math Instructional Leader support for teachers and students

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Progress Monitoring via formative assessments

Person Responsible Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)

ELA & Math Pullout Groups

Person Responsible Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@browardschools.com)

ELA & Math support in the after-school program

Person Responsible Nichola Gayle (nichola.stephenson@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.

The school leadership team will work collaboratively with staff to create a plan of action to address the priorities. Coaches, Instructional Leaders, Support Facilitators will provide additional support to students and teachers. ESE support facilitators will work collaboratively with all content area teachers in PLCs to create an implementation plan for students while in Learning strategies class. The school-wide literacy initiative will be common practice in all classrooms. Administration will monitor the progress of all students through data review, student evidence, and instructional conversations with teachers.

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 school administration works collaboratively with all stakeholders in order to make informed decisions relating to school improvement. Our School Advisory Council plays an active role in the decision making relating to school improvement and they support the needs of our students and staff. We operate under a mantra of family in which each stakeholder knows they are valued and respected and that is communicated on an ongoing basis.

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

Administrators - build staff moral and provide positive behavior incentives for students
 Staff - maintain positive interactions
 Students - act responsibly and shows respect for all
 Parents - work along staff to provide a positive environment where student feel supported
 Community Members - positively promote the school to outsiders

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00