The Seed School Of Miami

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

The Seed School Of Miami

1901 NW 127 ST, Miami, FL 33167

www.miamiseedschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Kara Locke

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
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 Dade 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

The Seed School Of Miami

1901 NW 127 ST, Miami, FL 33167

www.miamiseedschool.org

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)
High School 6-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	Yes	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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 SEED School of Miami is a college-preparatory, public boarding school for South Florida students. Our mission is to provide an outstanding educational program that empowers students to be successful, both academically and socially, in college and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

SEED Miami serves students who most benefit from a 24-hour program. Our students are provided with the types of experiences, opportunities, and supports, inside and outside the classroom, that are essential to success in a college environment. Our alumni will attend high quality four-year colleges, based upon SEED's measure of green/yellow/red tier colleges and universities, and graduate from college at rates higher than their non-SEED counterparts.

SEED Miami will embody the nine principles of all SEED network schools:
• Principle #1 – College-Bound Culture
• Principle #2 – 24-hour Learning Environment
• Principle #3 – Positive Culture of High Expectations
• Principle #4 – Integrated and Engaging Program to Foster Love of Learning
• Principle #5 – Individual Student Support
• Principle #6 – Focus on Data and Continuous Improvement
• Principle #7 – Recruiting and Nurturing Outstanding Educators
• Principle #8 – Family and School Partnership
• Principle #9 – Community Relationships

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
Padro, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
O'Hara, Cristine	Principal	
Thomas, Latrice	Assistant Principal	
Washington, Derik	Other	
Lewis, Eric	Registrar	
Thomas, Theresa	Principal	
Locke, Kara	Other	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/12/2019

Prior Year - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	12	9	8	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	18	21	22	0	0	0	106

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	19	12	10	10	0	0	0	51

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	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	12	9	8	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	18	21	22	0	0	0	106

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	19	12	10	10	0	0	0	51

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%	59%	56%	0%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	51%	0%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	42%	0%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	54%	51%	0%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	68%	68%	0%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	73%	0%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	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)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (6)
One or more suspensions	0 (13)	0 (12)	0 (9)	0 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (42)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (4)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (45)	0 (18)	0 (21)	0 (22)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (106)

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	28%	58%	-30%	54%	-26%
	2018	28%	53%	-25%	52%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	26%	56%	-30%	52%	-26%
	2018	33%	54%	-21%	51%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	34%	60%	-26%	56%	-22%
	2018	39%	59%	-20%	58%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
09	2019	20%	55%	-35%	55%	-35%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
10	2019	26%	53%	-27%	53%	-27%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	15%	58%	-43%	55%	-40%
	2018	22%	56%	-34%	52%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	29%	53%	-24%	54%	-25%
	2018	24%	52%	-28%	54%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	12%	40%	-28%	46%	-34%
	2018	18%	38%	-20%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	11%	43%	-32%	48%	-37%
	2018	28%	44%	-16%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	36%	68%	-32%	67%	-31%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	73%	-25%	71%	-23%
2018	65%	72%	-7%	71%	-6%
Compare		-17%			

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	57%	63%	-6%	61%	-4%
2018	27%	59%	-32%	62%	-35%
Compare		30%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	17%	54%	-37%	57%	-40%
2018					

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	10	35	45	14	29						
ELL	18	43	43	19	38	50	10	27			
BLK	27	31	25	27	39	45	25	45			
HSP	27	45	36	29	43	31	28	45			
FRL	28	35	28	30	40	40	21	49			
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	37
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	35
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	33
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	36
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	37
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.

Mathematics achievement at SEED Miami was of lowest performance last school year. One significant factor leading to this trend was the lack of highly qualified teaching candidates for our mathematics vacancies. Another factor were baseline scores. Our average incoming student scored

below proficiency in mathematics prior to their entry to SEED and growth to proficiency with several grade levels of required growth takes time beyond a single school year.

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

One area of decline was 9th grade ELA scores. Factors that contributed to this decline included second entry point students and related student scores, and staffing a teacher vacancy.

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.

6th grade math scores were the area of greatest gap. Our average student last year came in performing on a 3.1 grade level in mathematics (average previous FSA score - 1.9). This diagnostic data tells us that our students will need appropriate strategies and time in order to reach proficiency in math.

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

9th grade math scores showed a significant increase (30% difference). Several factors contributed to this increase in proficiency. The curriculum was appropriately aligned with year-end state benchmarks and paced efficiently. Student Data Days allowed for students to partake in knowing and owning their data and contributing to action planning.

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

An area of concern from the EWS data Part I (D) is ESE student performance. We saw a significant gap between the performance of our ESE and non-ESE students this past school year. The school has hired additional staff and leadership over our ESE/ESOL department to address this area in the 19-20 school year.

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

1. Advancing our Mathematics curriculum and student outcomes in mathematics
2. Improving the performance of our ESE students on the state assessment
3. Implementing universal approaches to literacy instruction in the content areas
4. Adopting programs and practices for learning in the dormitory setting to advance academic goals
5. Expanding Advanced Placement and other opportunities for high performing students to engage in

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics Instruction
Rationale	Mathematics is our subject area of highest priority for the 19-20 school year based on summative test scores from the 18-19 school year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Per our contract with FL DOE: 50% of our students will improve their test scores as compared to the prior school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jesika Laster (jlaster@miami.seedschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of Eureka math curriculum & targeted interventions specific to math (to include the Math Bridge courses in high school)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Eureka math program is adopted by the network of SEED schools to advance our math goals. It is a research based program and aligns to our state and local goals for mathematics achievement.

Action Step	
Description	1. PD for all math instructors on Eureka math program 2. Monitoring of lesson plans and feedback loop 3. Daily common planning sessions for math teachers 4. Data Days scheduled to review math data (NWEA MAP assessments) 5. Observation and conferencing with teachers
Person Responsible	Jesika Laster (jlaster@miami.seedschool.org)

#2	
Title	Literacy Growth
Rationale	We continue to strive for greater outcomes with our ELA results, as measured by the NWEA MAP Growth Assessment, state exams, and F&P assessments. Using the gift of time in our 24-hour setting, we will advance the rate of growth during the 19-20 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Per our contract with FDOE: 50% of all students will make learning gains on the 2020 FSA exam in ELA 40% of 6th grade students will read at a level W or above by EOY 50% of 7th grade students will read at a level Y or above by EOY 70% of 8th grade students will read at a level Z or above by EOY
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jesika Laster (jlaster@miami.seedschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of the Reader & Writers workshop curriculum Book clubs and literacy instruction in the dormitory Leveled reading libraries in all MS classrooms Differentiated strategies for leveled readers Interventions matched by student needs for all TI groups
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies are core components of the Teachers College Writers and Readers Workshop methodology (the work guided by Lucy Caulkins and her Units of Study)
Action Step	
Description	1. PD for all literacy staff 2. Roll out of curriculum & expectations 3. Monitoring of lessons plans and weekly agendas 4. Ongoing support through weekly content meetings and faculty meetings 5. Data Days to review and monitor the results of ongoing NWEA MAP assessment data
Person Responsible	Jesika Laster (jlaster@miami.seedschool.org)

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 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.

The SEED School of Miami works with families in a variety of ways. Our leadership team conducts home visits with every family during the enrollment process to begin the work of establishing healthy and trusting relationships between school staff and parents. Additionally, throughout the year we engage our families in activities on campus, Family Nights, honors assemblies, report card conferences, and other opportunities to connect.

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.

The SEED School of Miami requires all new 6th grade students to attend a one-week summer Orientation program that allows them to live in a boarding school environment and take classes and participate in activities similar to our regular school year program. This allows our students to participate in a simulation of the true SEED experience prior to the onset of the new school year and eases the transition into our school.

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

Collectively, the Head of School, Director of Operations, and Director of Finance meet regularly to discuss resource allocation. The programmatic leaders of the school meet weekly and discuss and determine allocation of finances towards the programmatic needs of the school such as curriculum, student support services, and activities based on the following criteria: research-based programs, match of program to student need (via data driven assessment), scope of targeted students, cost, alignment with mission, and anticipated results.

Lastly, the Head of School, Director of Operations, and Human Resource Manager respectively determine the allocation of finances towards personnel.

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.

N/A

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

SEED Miami has a plethora of partnerships with local and national organizations that advance our college-bound mission. This includes college tours, college rep visits to campus, and programmatic partnerships.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Literacy Growth	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**