Broward County Public Schools

Seagull School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Seagull School

425 SW 28TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33315

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Charisse Merchant James

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
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	CS&I

* 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

Seagull School

425 SW 28TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33315

[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 PK-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year	**2011-12**
Grade	

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 Seagull Alternative High School is to provide students with a safe environment where they can demonstrate academic, social and emotional improvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to empower each student to become a productive citizen who demonstrates character traits and pursues college and career opportunities.

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
Lee, Kelvin	Principal	Principal of the school. Oversees all operations and curriculum decisions for the school.
Nichols, Kendra	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal of the school. Oversees all operations and curriculum decisions for the school.
Taylor Johnson, Tami	SAC Member	Principal's Confidential Assistant/Office Manager
Bodah, Marcus	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics teacher and SAC Chair. Manages all areas associated with school improvement.

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	0	1	3	7	34	66	152	263
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	67	71	82	81	88	489
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	57	23	25	19	157
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	76	85	89	450

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	66	71	52	47	63	299

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	6	0	35	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	20	13	19	85

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/7/2019

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	0	100	100	83	96	85	86	550
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	33	34	43	16	151
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	10	1	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	100	87	90	477

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	100	100	100	75	62	49	486

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	0%	58%	61%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	58%	62%	0%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	52%	0%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	51%	56%	0%	46%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	74%	78%	0%	71%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													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)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	34 (0)	66 (0)	152 (0)	263 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	100 ()	67 ()	71 ()	82 ()	81 ()	88 ()	489 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	33 (0)	57 (0)	23 (0)	25 (0)	19 (0)	157 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	100 (0)	100 (0)	76 (0)	85 (0)	89 (0)	450 (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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	55%	-55%	52%	-52%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	57%	-57%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	13%	53%	-40%	53%	-40%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	45%	-45%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	43%	-43%	48%	-48%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	15%	67%	-52%	67%	-52%
2018	6%	62%	-56%	65%	-59%
Compare		9%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	70%	-70%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	15%	67%	-52%	70%	-55%
2018	2%	66%	-64%	68%	-66%
Compare		13%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	3%	56%	-53%	57%	-54%
2018	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Compare		3%			

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	
ELL										14	
BLK									20	21	5
HSP											
FRL									17	15	7
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	9
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	35
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	83%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	14
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	12
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	0
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	13
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

The lowest data component was gains in English language Arts (ELA). All lower level students were not targeted for remediation. Progress monitoring was not consistent.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was English language Arts (ELA). All lower level students were not targeted for remediation. Progress monitoring was not consistent.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap was English language Arts (ELA). All lower level students were not targeted for remediation. Progress monitoring was not consistent.

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

Mathematics gains was the data component that showed the greatest improvement. There was a focus on data chats and remediation for lower level students.

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

Potential areas of concern are attendance and the percentage of students who scored at achievement level 1 in ELA.

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

1. ELA gains
2. Mathematics gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English Language Arts (ELA) is the area of focus for all groups..
Rationale	Thirty two percent of students made learning gains in ELA in 2019. This is down from 58 percent in 2018.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, 50 percent of students tested will make learning gains in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelvin Lee (kelvin.lee@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Explicit vocabulary instruction in all classrooms and curriculums.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Vocabulary development is essential for reading comprehension especially for older students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Reading, language arts and social studies teachers will meet monthly to plan lessons together. 2. The literacy coach will conduct trainings specifically geared towards all teachers in Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC). 3. Data chats will be conducted on a quarterly basis with teachers to discuss and monitor student progress. 4. Teachers will assess students and monitor mastery of ELA standards. 5. Teachers will chart progress and provide remediation and enrichment for students.
Person Responsible	Kelvin Lee (kelvin.lee@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).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts (ELA) is the area of focus for all groups..				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0601 - Seagull School	School Improvement Funds		$5,000.00
			Notes: School Improvement funds will be utilized to purchase licences for Achieve 3000 which is an evidence based program to increase reading levels.			
					Total:	$5,000.00