

Broward County Public Schools

Seminole Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Seminole Middle School

6200 SW 16TH ST, Plantation, FL 33317

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Emily Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 10/25/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	TS&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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Seminole Middle School

6200 SW 16TH ST, Plantation, FL 33317

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">53%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">75%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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.

Seminole Middle School strives to empower all students to achieve at their highest potential and to become productive members in their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Seminole Middle School vision is for all students to achieve at their highest potential. We embody this purpose through the various academic programs offered at Seminole Middle School. First, we have the D.E.C.A.L (Division of Enhanced Communication and Law) Program. Students in 6th-8th grade who earned a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Reading and Math apply to be in the program when they enter 6th grade. 6th grade lays the framework for the program with a course in Study Skills and advanced core classes. Students are expected to excel and work at a higher level than their peers not in the D.E.C.A.L program. Classes are project based and very challenging. Moving onto 7th grade students are enrolled in their core classes, as well as up to 3 high school level courses, Algebra, Speech and Debate, and either Spanish or American Sign Language. In addition the core classes are also preparing the students for not just 8th grade but also success in high school and beyond. Finally, 8th grade students enrolled in D.E.C.A.L have the opportunity to take up to 5 high school credits: Biology, Algebra or Geometry, Spanish or American Sign Language, Law, and either Psychology & Sociology, Creative Writing or Debate 2. These classes are offered in addition to the core classes 8th graders must take. The rigor and standards in these courses is extremely high so that students have an easy transfer into their prospective high schools.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Marlow, Kathryn	Principal	Instructional Leader of the school environment with 1100 students. Oversee all aspects of the school from instruction to safety.
Smith, Tameka	Assistant Principal	Intern Principal, 8th Grade Administrator, Reading and Language Arts Administrator
Rappaport, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair, Unified Arts Department Head
Deklavon, William	Assistant Principal	Intern Principal, 7th Grade Administrator, Math Administrator
Bozeman, Cambreia	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head
Brunache, Sparkle	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach, Reading Department Head
Fiorentino, Jill	Assistant Principal	6th Grade Assistant Principal, Science and Social Studies Administrator
McDonough, Jeannine	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Head
McNiven, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Head
Regan, Annmarie	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Head
Sakowitz, Alan	Other	ESE Specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 10/25/2020, Emily Gonzalez

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

41

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

24

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	397	385	387	0	0	0	0	1169
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	43	56	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	48	64	0	0	0	0	166
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	54	32	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	103	126	0	0	0	0	337

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	54	69	0	0	0	0	181

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	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	8

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
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	397	385	387	0	0	0	0	1169
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	43	56	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	48	64	0	0	0	0	166
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	54	32	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	103	126	0	0	0	0	337

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	54	69	0	0	0	0	181

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	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	8

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	60%	57%	54%	55%	56%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	57%	54%	52%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	48%	47%	38%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	59%	60%	58%	65%	59%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	58%	57%	58%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	49%	51%	53%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	53%	49%	51%	53%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	71%	72%	64%	73%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	59%	57%	2%	54%	5%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	60%	55%	5%	52%	8%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	51%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	56%	59%	-3%	56%	0%
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	54%	58%	-4%	55%	-1%
	2018	60%	55%	5%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	53%	5%	54%	4%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	54%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	19%	45%	-26%	46%	-27%
	2018	29%	47%	-18%	45%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	38%	43%	-5%	48%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	45%	-7%	50%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	67%	33%	67%	33%
2018	96%	62%	34%	65%	31%
Compare		4%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	71%	-1%	71%	-1%
2018	65%	70%	-5%	71%	-6%
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	85%	61%	24%	61%	24%
2018	87%	63%	24%	62%	25%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	56%	44%	57%	43%
2018	98%	51%	47%	56%	42%
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	24	41	35	24	35	38	20	39	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
ELL	35	55	49	37	45	46	35	34	80		
ASN	73	68		74	55		67	90	75		
BLK	42	47	36	40	42	36	34	54	84		
HSP	59	62	49	58	53	45	53	66	82		
MUL	64	47		61	52		63	56	57		
WHT	74	59	34	76	56	40	67	89	87		
FRL	49	52	38	48	48	40	42	60	73		
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	40	35	34	49	47	22	31	71		
ELL	26	49	51	34	54	49	35	43	71		
ASN	68	65		86	62		58	80	90		
BLK	41	49	41	50	57	50	31	53	85		
HSP	56	54	46	63	63	56	46	63	76		
MUL	59	58		70	76	83	57	85	85		
WHT	73	66	48	78	69	61	65	78	87		
FRL	47	53	46	56	60	53	37	56	79		
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	36	30	27	48	41	23	26	43		
ELL	26	44	43	48	60	53	50	46	50		
ASN	67	67		81	81			83			
BLK	34	42	37	45	53	48	27	44	65		
HSP	53	52	42	64	60	56	51	60	70		
MUL	63	57	45	68	51		68	71	71		
WHT	72	57	31	81	60	63	79	78	91		
FRL	43	45	32	54	55	48	40	50	71		

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	59
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	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	590

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
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	46
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	60
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	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	65
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Responses based on the 2019 FSA. The 2020 FSA was canceled due to COVID-19. The data area that showed the lowest performance on the 2019 FSA was the area of math. We saw scores drop due to a number of reasons. First, we lost a few teachers at the start of the school year and it took a few months to replace them due to the lack of qualified staff and the hiring process. Later in the year, we had a math teacher out on medical leave for a few weeks. Without qualified teachers in the classes students, scores dropped.

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

Responses based on the 2019 FSA. The 2020 FSA was canceled due to COVID-19. The data component that showed the greatest decline from the 2018 to 2019 school year on the FSA was in the area of math. Our math scores dropped a considerable amount due to a few staffing issues. After losing a teacher at the start of the school year and later a teacher on medical leave, our students did not show growth on the FSA.

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.

Responses based on the 2019 FSA. The 2020 FSA was canceled due to COVID-19. When comparing our data to the state data we noticed the largest gap was in the Math Lowest Quartile. Our lowest 25% had 41% learning gains whereas, the state average was 51% learning gains. There was also a drop in learning gains overall. Our learning gains were 51% while the state average was 57%. Last year there were a number of changes in the math department. We had a teacher change schools and it took a while to replace them. In prior years we also had all level 1 and level 1 students enrolled in a second math class. We did not do this with all level 2 students last year. We feel these factors led to the gap between our learning gains and the state average.

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

Responses based on the 2019 FSA. The 2020 FSA was canceled due to COVID-19. The data component that showed the most improvement from the 2018-2019 school year was the Civics EOC. Our Civics scores went up 3 percentage points over the past year. Our school focused on Civics in 6th-grade history courses. We also spoke to other schools that had similar ELA scores to us but much higher Civics scores. We learned they adopted a specific textbook and curriculum to use with their students. We purchased the book for use with our students. Although we only had the book for a short time we felt that it was beneficial toward the growth we saw in Civics.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Responses based on the 2019 FSA. The 2020 FSA was canceled due to COVID-19. When looking at the EWS data it appears that we have a high number of students who are failing either their ELA course or Math course. We also have a similar number of students with one or more suspension. Although the data doesn't show specific students or the relationship between the two categories, we know that the more students are disruptive in class (which results in referrals) the more likely they are to fail the course. These are the same students who might be testing at Level 1 in either Reading or Math. Our school has adopted a school-wide positive behavior plan which will help decrease the number of students who are suspended multiple times. We also hope to increase the ELA and math scores of our lowest quartile.

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

1. Math Learning Gains and Proficiency
2. ELA Learning Gains and Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. Civics Proficiency
5. Lowest 25th Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities scored below 40% FPPL, therefore we want to focus on our students with disabilities to increase their reading and math proficiency, as well as, reading and math learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, Students with Disabilities will score at or above 41% FPPL.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jill Fiorentino (jill.fiorentino@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: In order to increase the proficiency and learning gains of our students with disabilities we are going to utilize school-wide programs that focus on reading and math and increasing content knowledge. We will also work with the support facilitators to work on individual student goals through small group instruction. They will also receive remediation and support from their support facilitators to ensure students are grasping new knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small group instruction and specialized and focused support will help our students be successful because when they are given individualized attention they are able to ask questions, be given specific feedback and work on their individual needs. The teachers are following the students IEP goals and providing feedback to the Support Facilitators.

Action Steps to Implement

The following action steps will be utilized in order to increase the proficiency and learning gains of our students with disabilities. First, teachers will read and follow all of the Individualized Education Plans of their students. They will also document how the students are progressing with their goals. Teachers will meet as a team and with the Support Facilitators every Tuesday morning from 7:15 am to 7:50 am. The teachers will work as teams to determine their students needs and if any of their students need remediation for skills taught that week. If they do, they will be pulled out for small group instruction. Every two weeks, teachers will turn in their IEP documents that show student progress towards their IEP goals to the SWD teachers. Together teachers will work with their SWD to help remediate and reteach skills. Classroom teachers will also utilize schoolwide programs like Imagine Math, USATest Prep, and Coach Digital. Also, teachers will collect data monthly through common assessments to determine how their students are progressing. They will have data chats with this information to discuss student needs and student achievement. They will also use this data to drive instruction for their students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Jill Fiorentino (jill.fiorentino@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Improving student literacy will improve overall student performance and academic growth. All students can show improvement throughout all content areas based on their ability to read and their literacy skills.

Measurable Outcome: Based on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment, Seminole Middle School plans to increase student proficiency in literacy, as well as, increase the learning gains of students with disabilities by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tameka Smith (tameka.smith@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: In order to increase student proficiency in reading and language arts, we will ensure that all content teachers are incorporating reading strategies and word study skills in their content area classes. Teachers will use research-based reading strategies (like text marking, highlighting, QAR) during all their classes while incorporating informational, content-based text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If students are taught how to read and mark informational text throughout their content area classes than they will be able to increase their reading comprehension in their ELA courses. Understanding how to mark text will also allow the students to understand how to pick out the important information, how to understand and use context clues, and how to ignore the information that isn't important. This skill will carry through to their content courses and help with comprehension of higher-order thinking skills and strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

In order to improve the literacy of the students in our school, both proficiency and learning gains first we will utilize PLC time to teach content area teachers how to teach and use text marking strategies and how to incorporate informational text into their content areas. Next, we will work as department teams during departmental common planning to plan lessons and strategies that incorporate higher level reading skills and strategies. We will also implement informational text and research-based reading strategies, as well as, text marking strategies school-wide. We will also collect data from monthly progress monitoring checks. Finally, we will discuss data and ways to remediate and enrich during PLC meetings, common planning time, and during Principal data chats.

Person Responsible: Tameka Smith (tameka.smith@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

An additional area of focus for Seminole Middle School is increasing our math learning gains and math proficiency. Math teachers are utilizing district curriculum and planning tools to ensure they are meeting the students' needs. The math department has also been looking at the district curriculum map and working to realign their curriculum in order to best meet the needs of the students. They are also working as a department to address student needs once they receive their monthly progress monitoring data. Teachers are also utilizing iReady for diagnostic information to help guide teaching decisions.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school continues to have parent training for all core subject areas. These events are held in school and at the Plantation Library. Parents will be given ample notification to attend each event. The training will be designed to build parent capacity based on student’s needs. During parent training, academic resources, success strategies, and grade-level expectations will be discussed in depth. There are also personal training stations during Parent and Family Engagement events.

Parents and families will be informed of the incoming and outgoing readiness skills that their children should be proficient in. Summer reading and math packets will be available online and at the school to minimize student learning loss during time away from school. This will increase academic output during the holidays and parents will have the option to still foster their child’s academic growth.

Special emphasis will be placed on identifying and eliminating barriers to any population that appears to be underserved. Care will be taken to ensure that families understand the academic achievement levels and state standards during literacy training. Finally, parents and families will be informed via parent links, flyers, website,s and conferences of the existence of all parent and student enrichment programs in order to increase capacity and engagement will translate into increase student achievement. Positive relationships are fostered with parents through volunteering, chaperoning, literacy training, and parent technology lab.

The school will provide materials and resources for parents to provide at-home support in Math, ELA, Science, and Social Studies. Students will be showcasing what they learn for parents during the family nights.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$6,692.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
5900	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	1891 - Seminole Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$6,692.00	

						<i>Notes: To run and fund Extened Learning Opportunities for students to increase their math and literacy proficiency.</i>
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$10,136.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	1891 - Seminole Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$10,136.00
						<i>Notes: Technology for student use to access online materials, lessons, and activities. Technology will be used to support student learning and growth.</i>
Total:						\$16,828.00