

Broward County Public Schools

Plantation High School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Plantation High School

6901 NW 16TH ST, Plantation, FL 33313

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Parinaz Bristol

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (46%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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	ATSI
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	91%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bristol , Parinaz	Principal	Supervises and manages all aspects of the school
Rios, Sylvia	Assistant Principal	Supervises the World Language, CTE, Fine Arts, PE, and Facilities departments and is the admin for 12th grade.
Major, Horatio	Assistant Principal	Supervises the Math and Science department, Activities/Athletics and is the admin for the 11th grade
Gayle, Nichola	Assistant Principal	Supervises the English department, testing, and Cambridge and is the admin for the 10th grade
Andre, Alin	Assistant Principal	Supervises the Social Studies and guidance department and is the admin for 9th grade

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Parinaz Bristol

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

80

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,825

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

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

13

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	584	581	493	422	2080	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	258	237	213	912	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	90	52	31	296	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	159	133	25	423	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	115	77	26	336	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208	204	86	57	555	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	262	241	66	6	575	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	55	0	0	94	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	268	244	155	73	740

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	22	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	1	1	4	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	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

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	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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	36%	52%	51%				40%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						43%	52%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						35%	45%	42%
Math Achievement	18%	41%	38%				31%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains	42%						31%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						30%	43%	45%
Science Achievement	37%	35%	40%				56%	66%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	51%	48%				54%	71%	73%

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

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
2022					
2019	55%	67%	-12%	67%	-12%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	52%	67%	-15%	70%	-18%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	24%	61%	-37%	61%	-37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	34%	56%	-22%	57%	-23%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	26	20	10	29	39	24	38		97	22
ELL	14	31	26	6	41	47	18	29		90	58
ASN	53	55		23				70			
BLK	32	42	31	16	41	55	35	50		95	45
HSP	37	47	24	18	53	57	36	58		96	59
MUL	50	35					50				
WHT	56	49		37	37		53	84		88	65
FRL	31	42	33	15	40	54	34	50		95	49
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
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	497
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	50
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Math Algebra 1 and Geometry showed double digit learning gains including the lowest 25th percentile.

ELA 10th grade proficiency scores remain stagnant and show a decline in proficiency from the previous year's scores.

SWD and ESOL subgroups fall below the 41% federal index.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Although mathematics proficiency is up 4 percentage points at 18% per the 2022 end of year statewide assessment from 2021, it's a major area of concern.

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

Students have major gaps over the past 2 years and teachers are being strategic by filling in gaps for students. The addition of SAVVAS assists with differentiating instruction for students

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Mathematics learning gains are up 42% from 20% per the 2022 end of year statewide assessment.

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

Teachers worked collaboratively in their Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to disaggregate data to plan effectively to fill in gaps.

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

More intense strategic planning and consistency for standards-based instruction and professional development.

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.

Ongoing professional development via Savvas to plan standards based lesson and using data to inform instruction.

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

Collaborative PLCs and professional development for the new math curriculum via Savvas.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The SWD subgroup is below the ESSA federal index at 32% and the ELL subgroup is also below at 36%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By June 2023, the SWD and ELL subgroups will increase to 41% or higher per the Federal Index for achievement.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Student success will be monitored based on quarterly common formative assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified] Small group instruction within the general education courses The addition of SAVVAS learning system will assist with differentiating instruction for students Prescribed support plan for SWD by the ESE facilitators in the Learning Strategies courses
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students are scheduled in Learning Strategies courses to receive additional instructional support
Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.	
ESE Support Facilitators will join and work with the ELA and Math Professional Learning Communities and incorporate strategies in their Learning Strategies classes.	
Person Responsible	Alin Andre (alin.andre@browardschools.com)
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	Horatio Major (horatio.major@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Mathematics achievement has the need for the greatest improvement with proficiency at 18% (up from 14% in 2021-22).

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Mathematics proficiency will increase from 18% to 28% by June 2023, per the end of year, statewide assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Frequent data conversations among assistant principal, math department head, and math teachers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Horatio Major (horatio.major@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Instructional planning during Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
Planning instruction using a the state approved text for Mathematics

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Based on the data and the years of gaps for students. Teachers must collaborate to plan standards based lesson to address the gaps in learning.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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)

Structured Professional Learning Communities

Person Responsible

Horatio Major (horatio.major@browardschools.com)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

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