

Broward County Public Schools

# Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

# Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy

5803 NW 94TH AVE, Tamarac, FL 33321

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Gastride Harigan

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School 6-9
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

## Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy

5803 NW 94TH AVE, Tamarac, FL 33321

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School 6-9	Yes	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

### 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 Millennium 6-12 Collegiate Academy is to provide a stimulating and safe environment where each students' diversified needs are challenged and social needs are met creating productive citizens and lifelong learners.

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

Our vision statement is S.T.A.R.S, where "Students are Soaring To Achieve Success" and become Career and College-Ready.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baugh, Francine	Principal	School Principal, hiring, budget, evaluation of staff, Title 1 budget, and developing leadership skills for her Assistant Principals. Ms. Baugh became Principal of Millenium 6-12 Collegiate Academy on July 1, 2018.
Edun, Narissa	Assistant Principal	Assist with Master Scheduling, Monitor SAC and Title 1, Math and Science departments, and Grade 6 Discipline
Pluim, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of High School Calculus classes, SAC Chairperson, Title 1 Liaison, and Science/Math Support
Bagwell, Holly	Instructional Coach	To monitor Lietracy data nd model lessons for all ELA teachers
Gayle, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal over all Grade 7 students and teachers/Administrator over ELA
Satty, Paul	Assistant Principal	Administrator over all grade 8 students and teachers, monitors facilities and safety
Schorr, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Math Coach, monitors all math assessments and data, models for math teachers, and serves as our ESOL Contact for all ELL students
Dominique, Alexandria	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist, Creates schedules for all ESE paraprofessionals, holds IEP meetings, and conducts professional learning on teaching SWD students

### Early Warning Systems

**Current Year****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	473	538	524	79	70	0	0	1684
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	41	52	5	1	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	166	118	162	1	5	0	0	452
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	57	1	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	209	157	0	0	0	0	521
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	86	105	0	0	0	0	290

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	7	0	0	0	0	25

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

82

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

Monday 8/19/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

**Prior Year - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	86	45	3	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	86	112	1	0	0	0	294
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	42	48	1	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	190	137	1	0	0	0	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	58	79	82	0	0	0	0	219

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	58%	61%	51%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	59%	56%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	54%	43%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	57%	58%	62%	61%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%	58%	59%	63%	53%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	51%	52%	51%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	51%	56%	49%	46%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	74%	78%	80%	71%	75%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	6	7	8	9	
Number of students enrolled	473 (0)	538 (0)	524 (0)	79 (0)	1614 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	33 ( )	41 ( )	52 ( )	5 ( )	131 (0)
One or more suspensions	166 (0)	118 (0)	162 (0)	1 (0)	447 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 (0)	13 (0)	57 (0)	1 (0)	80 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	155 (0)	209 (0)	157 (0)	0 (0)	521 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	51%	57%	-6%	54%	-3%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	47%	55%	-8%	52%	-5%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	51%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	50%	59%	-9%	56%	-6%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	58%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
09	2019	97%	57%	40%	55%	42%
	2018	95%	55%	40%	53%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	58%	58%	0%	55%	3%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	54%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	41%	45%	-4%	46%	-5%
	2018	53%	47%	6%	45%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	27%	43%	-16%	48%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	12%	45%	-33%	50%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	67%	31%	67%	31%
2018	88%	62%	26%	65%	23%
Compare		10%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	71%	0%	71%	0%
2018	66%	70%	-4%	71%	-5%
Compare		5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	61%	16%	61%	16%
2018	87%	63%	24%	62%	25%
Compare		-10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	56%	34%	57%	33%
2018	88%	51%	37%	56%	32%
Compare		2%			

### Subgroup Data

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	37	31	17	39	42	5	43	50		

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
ELL	37	49	41	47	54	40	31	59	59		
ASN	80	67		88	66			70	92		
BLK	51	50	40	54	48	40	38	69	68		
HSP	54	54	41	55	51	45	47	80	67		
MUL	60	55		64	51	60	50	72	75		
WHT	68	59	47	69	55	46	63	79	78		
FRL	50	51	42	53	49	40	39	70	68		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	45	43	23	39	35	18	21	25		
ELL	25	48	49	39	48	47	21	61	46		
ASN	72	69		76	66		62		83		
BLK	50	53	49	56	51	49	46	67	79		
HSP	55	57	46	61	54	49	59	65	74		
MUL	66	64	58	67	42		78	63	83		
WHT	64	61	44	66	56	54	52	84	84		
FRL	49	53	47	55	52	51	45	66	76		
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	35	29	25	44	38	17	45	36		
ELL	24	44	52	33	50	43	24	48	36		
ASN	71	72		79	76				82		
BLK	48	54	42	58	62	50	46	77	73		
HSP	51	55	43	62	62	50	44	88	66		
MUL	61	67	60	77	70		69	89	67		
WHT	58	59	44	65	66	55	60	81	80		
FRL	46	54	45	57	61	49	45	77	70		

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	548

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
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	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	63
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Our SWD student subgroup showed the lowest performance in the technical subject areas, specifically in math and science. The scores for math proficiency was below 20%, and our lowest 25% of the SWD subgroup were below 30% on learning gians. In Science, the subgroup only had 5% proficient. Our SWD subgroup only scored a 17% proficiency last year.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

The data that showed the greatest decline with our SWD subgroup was in Science, whcih decreased by 13% from the prior year, and Civics, which decreased by 22%. Additionally, the middle school acceleration courses our SWD students took had a decrease of 25% in their scores. Many of our SWD students were mainstreamed and support facilitators did some pullouts and push in groups. Many of the staff members were new to teaching SWD students, but did take trainings throughout the school year on Comprehension strategies for SWD subgroup as well as differrentiation. The training sessions needed to begin at the start of the school, with the ESE Specialist as one of our main facilitators.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Our 7th grade ELA and Math data were both in the negative area when compared to state and averages for proficiency. ELA showed a -5% and Math showed a -6%. Our 8th grade Science proficiency data showed a -8% compared to the state average. This past year, we had many new staff members that were not trained in the new Marzano Instructional Model, to the extent they needed to be. They were given an overall training, but the high effect strategies needed to be infused into our monthly professional learning sessions.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Our ELA high school students, grade 9, showed 42% above the state average for proficiency and our grade 6 math was 12% above the state average for proficiency. We have a collegiate academy for our 9-11th graders, and they come in with high achievement levels in ELA. Our teachers were able to maintain those levels.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Our ELL subgroup had 48% as the Federal Index last year, which was the closest subgroup after SWD to reach the 41% and below level. Our African American subgroup had their Federal Index at 51% which was the next lowest subgroup. These subgroups will be monitored through the master scheduling process and our Filemaker Pro database for common formative assessment proficiency and data chats.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. Science Achievement in Grade 8 for all subgroups (including SWD students)
2. Math Learning Gains in the lowest 25% (including SWD students)
3. ELA Learning Gains in the lowest 25% (including SWD students)
4. Math overall learning gains (including SWD students)
5. ELA overall learning gains (including SWD students)

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Lowest 25% in Math Achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	Students in our lowest 25% scored below the 50% learning gains criteria, which decreased from last year.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By June, 2020, there will be a minimum of 10% increase in the lowest 25% learning gains for the math achievement as measured by the FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Francine Baugh (francine.baugh@browardschools.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Weekly progress monitoring and weekly level-up Fridays. Ongoing progress monitoring and feedback will increase student achievement in math.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	In the past year our instructional focus calendars included topics and standards, however, the progress monitoring tools and dates were not listed. This led to inconsistency among common assessments and feedback. Reteach and enrichment time was at various days of the week, but not on a consistent basis for monitoring purposes.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Our Math Coach and Mathematics Department Chair will create new instructional focus calendars for all four quarters to align with the District pacing charts and areas that need more instructional time based on our data.</p> <p>This will be shared during department meetings and common professional learning communities in an ongoing basis. Test Specifications and content limits will be analyzed during PLC sessions to align classwork activities and questioning that meets the rigor of each standard assessed. The Math Coach and Mathematics Department Chair will create common formative assessments using the IReady software and assist teachers in tracking their data. Quarterly data chats will take place in the Principal's office with Administration and support staff present. Zone walkthrough visits and collaboration will allow us to improve teacher effectiveness by providing them feedback from each visit. The teachers will receive support to prepare materials for progress monitoring on Wednesdays, using quick formative assessments and level up Friday ideas for reteach and enrichment activities.</p>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Francine Baugh (francine.baugh@browardschools.com)



#2	
<b>Title</b>	Lowest 25% in ELA Achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	Our lowest 25% in ELA scored below the 50% and decreased from last year. Many of our students in the lowest 25% in ELA are from the SWD subgroup. This subgroup needs more differentiated strategies in all classrooms.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By June, 2020 there will be an increase of at least 10% in the lowest 25% in learning gains.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Francine Baugh (francine.baugh@browardschools.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Specific literacy strategies will be an area of focus for this school year, and student evidence folders will be maintained.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Strategies will be streamlined for focus in all literacy-based classrooms so monitoring will be ongoing with feedback. Students will use engaging graphic organizers and templates while they are completing class assignments.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Our Literacy Coach and ELA Department Chair will assist in creating focused literacy strategies professional learning session bimonthly for all staff members to increase literacy strategies in all content areas.</p> <p>The Instructional Focus calendars will be based on the District's pacing guide and areas of need for FSA ELA clusters. The guides will be discussed at every professional learning communities where each staff member brings their instructional binders that include the calendars and test specifications to review. Common Formative Assessments will be created using the IReady software and data will be shared after each assessment during PLCs and data chats with Administration and support staff. We will have zone walkthroughs with our schools in our area and collaborate on areas that need improvement as well as areas that were working well in the classrooms. This feedback will be shared with staff for continuous growth with instructional practices.</p>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Francine Baugh (francine.baugh@browardschools.com)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	ELA achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	To increase the proficiency levels of ELA in the SWD subgroup to achieve on-grade level standards mastery, students will rotate through the computer lab twice per week to utilize the IReady program. They will also take two diagnostics prior to the 2020 FSA assessment in ELA.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By June, 2020 students in the SWD subgroup will increase their proficiency in ELA by at least 20% as measure by the FSA assessment 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Francine Baugh (francine.baugh@browardschools.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Cornell Note-Taking, Frayer Vocabulary strategy, and Technology Integration will be the major instructional strategies for all classrooms.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our SWD students need to have a focused research-based program to assist the teachers in diagnosing their weak areas and monthly data as they progress to the FSA assessment window.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	Our ESE Specialist and Assistant Principal will create a lab schedule to include access to technology such as IReady program and Vocabulary.com on a consistent basis. The ESE Support Facilitators will assist in the lab as well as in specific classrooms. The SWD data will be input into a filemaker utilities system to track the subgroup data on common formative assessments. The results and trends from these assessments will be discussed at quarterly data chats with students on a monthly basis, as well as with Administration and Support Staff. During Professional Learning Communities, teachers will share their strategies that were successful in teaching those specific benchmarks. The Literacy Coach will create an academic reward system created for students who demonstrate improvements in mastery levels each month.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Francine Baugh (francine.baugh@browardschools.com)

#4	
<b>Title</b>	Students with Disabilities
<b>Rationale</b>	Our SWD subgroup scored an overall 32% on the federal index and our number of SWD students remains consistent and may have increased.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By June 2020, the Students With Disabilities will increase their overall federal index to 41% or above as measured by success in all content areas.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Francine Baugh (francine.baugh@browardschools.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	All content area teachers will attend common planning professional learning communities on a weekly basis and meet with the same grade level to ensure there is consistency in the classrooms for instruction and assessments. Additionally, SWD students will have weekly progress monitoring formative assessments and "Level-Up" Fridays to do reteach and enrich skill levels in standards based instructional activities.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our common formative assessments are scheduled every three weeks in all content areas, however, we need to increase informal progress monitoring and immediate feedback in the content areas. Our SWD students will also receive additional assistance in the form of paraprofessionals support as well as pullout/push-in strategies with Literacy and Math Academic Coaches.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	The ESE Specialist and Academic Coaches will create a schedule of monthly professional learning topics on strategies for working with Students with Disabilities subgroup. Professional Learning Communities will have SWD personnel and Academic Coaches modeling strategies that are research-based and increase student engagement. Lesson planning will also be discussed at each PLC session to include specific and targeted SWD strategies as well as differentiation techniques. There will also be some District-Based training at the school site for teaching strategies for all areas of SWD category, including Gifted strategies. The ESE Specialist will conduct monthly trainings in monitoring all IEPs and EPs for Gifted students. PLC data chats along with data chats with Administration will provide information on this subgroup's growth and areas of need throughout the school year.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Francine Baugh (francine.baugh@browardschools.com)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

Stakeholder relationships will be a high priority through our school's SAC meetings, Title 1 parent seminars, and resource nights. Our SRO Office will continue to represent SAC as a community rep and prepare ongoing safety trainings for staff and parents. Parent family events will continue monthly.

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

#### **Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Each department (content area) will host a family night where parents and their child go through learning stations and gain resources to help their child continue to learn at home. Our community center located in the high school building and front office will have laptops available for parents to access surveys or other information they need and other documents.

#### **PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

#### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Our school has a CARE (Communicating About Real Experiences) period from 9:30-9:55 am where each student has an advisor/teacher to update them on critical information and our schoolwide positive behavior plan elements. They will also infuse Conscious Discipline modules and SEL activities during this CARE time, and review other school-wide policies and programs available for all students.

#### **Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Our school maintains good communication with leadership teams from our incoming feeder schools and outgoing feeder High Schools. The Guidance team creates schedules on when they do school visits to our feeder schools as well as sent out our flyers for parent events, etc. Additionally, the Administration attends all feeder schools open house events to support each other and keep the lines of communication open. The middle schools in our zone do walkthroughs to observe best practices being done in the classrooms.

#### **Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

Monthly SAC, SAF, and PTSA meetings are held with Administration and Leadership team. Our annual survey data is shared with staff and discussed at the leadership meetings to ensure we are aligning the resources staff needs. Persons responsible are the Principal, Assistant Principal over SAC and Title 1, SAC Chair, SAC Co-Chair, and Academic Coaches. The ESE Specialist and ESOL Contact also attend the monthly meetings to share information about the needs of those subgroups, and the plan to increase the scores of our SWD subgroup, which is the critical group that did not meet the ESSA index minimum. IEPs are shared and staff attend trainings with our ESE Specialist to ensure the students' differentiated needs are being met in the classroom and in their lesson plans.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

Our school has established a partnership with Broward College for our High School students to take their dual enrollment courses online with them, and still remain at the school. Additionally, our Guidance Director analyzes the data from log in information of classes using Naviance program and creates a calendar for Social Studies teachers to follow by grade level for the Naviance information. Our school also hosts a college and career day where various personnel from different agencies speak to our students about careers, and students who graduated speak to our students to answer questions about college and careers.. The High school students can take part in two college trips planned by our Guidance Director. Many of our field trips are based around different careers students can aspire for, including an engineering trip to the NSU campus.

## Part V: Budget

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Lowest 25% in Math Achievement</b>				<b>\$11,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1382	519-Technology-Related Supplies	4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy	Title, I Part A		\$11,500.00
			<i>Notes: The IREADY software will be available for all students in grades 6-8 for Math instruction. It will also include two school-wide summative assessments prior to the FSA and track each students' data points monthly.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Lowet 25% in ELA Achievement</b>				<b>\$11,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1382	519-Technology-Related Supplies	4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy	School Improvement Funds		\$11,500.00
			<i>Notes: IReady software for math program, including two diagnostics and the use of formative assessments and data reports.</i>			
			4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy			\$0.00
			4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy			\$0.00
			4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy			\$0.00
	2763	239-Other	4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Incentives for successful growth on IReady assessments in ELA and Math rpogress</i>			
			4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy			\$0.00
	2763	239-Other	4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Incentives for successful growth on IReady assessments in ELA and Math rpogress</i>			

			4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy			\$0.00
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ELA achievement</b>				<b>\$3,240.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3374	100-Salaries	4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy	School Improvement Funds		\$3,240.00
			<i>Notes: 6-week Math and ELA tutoring for test crunch time for the lowest 25% in ELA and Math subgroups.</i>			
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities</b>				<b>\$1,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2763	341000-SUPPLIES - GENERAL	4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Incentives provided for students showing success on improvement rates based on their common formative assessment data</i>			
			4772 - Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy			\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$32,740.00</b>