

Broward County Public Schools

Seagull School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	25
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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	2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: 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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	25
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lee, Kelvin	Principal	Instructional leader and oversees school operations.
Nichols, Kendra	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader and oversees school operations.
Bodah, Marcus	Teacher, K-12	English Language Arts (ELA) Team Leader. Instructional leader for ELA
Taylor Johnson, Tami	SAC Member	Principal's secretary and office manager. Oversees school improvement process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Charisse Merchant James

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.*

0

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

191

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

0

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

7

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	1	2	15	55	182	255	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	48	162	224	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	83	116	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	64	74	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	5	28	103	137	

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	5	5	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	29	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	2	10	31	91	160	294
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	23	79	141	255
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	24	35	72
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	0	0	24

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	2	4	12	32	79	129

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	2	0	0	0	58	60	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	15	42	67	

2020-21 - 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	0	0	2	10	31	91	160	294	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	23	79	141	255	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	24	35	72	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	0	0	24	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	0	0	24	

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	2	4	12	32	79	129

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	2	0	0	0	58	60
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	15	42	67

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					58%	61%		57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					58%	59%		57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	54%		49%	52%
Math Achievement					58%	62%		58%	61%
Math Learning Gains					58%	59%		56%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					51%	52%		49%	52%
Science Achievement					51%	56%		52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					74%	78%		75%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019	13%	53%	-40%	53%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	45%	-45%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	0%	43%	-43%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	15%	67%	-52%	67%	-52%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	15%	67%	-52%	70%	-55%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	3%	56%	-53%	57%	-54%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

FAIR for ELA, grade levels 9 -12. Spring FSA, ELA (9 -12). Spring EOC.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	1/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	1/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
US History	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	15/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	6/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	3/0%
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	2/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
US History	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	2/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	14/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	7/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	5/0%
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	2/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
US History	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	2/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	10/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	3/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	1/0%
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	2/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
US History	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	2/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD										50	
ELL										47	
BLK										40	9
HSP										38	
FRL										37	6

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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	22
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	44
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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

Native American Students	
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	25
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	38
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	22
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

There was an increase in the percentage of students making learning gains in ELA in comparison to 2019. Progress monitoring will continue throughout the school year to increase the percentage of students making learning gains in ELA. Students with disabilities, English language Learners, black/African American students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students all contributed to the gains in ELA.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Seagull has 47 percent of students making learning gains in ELA, however, only 40 percent of eligible students participated in state assessments last school year.. ELA is the component that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. Subgroups; students with disabilities, English language Learners, black/African American students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students did not meet proficiency and display the greatest need for improvement.

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

Not having students present on campus and poor attendance are contributing factors to this need for improvement. Having students attend school face-to-face and addressing the attendance rate are actions to be taken to improve the ELA scores. A tutoring camp will be held. Identifying subgroups; students with disabilities, English language Learners, black/African American students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students to attend the camp for additional support will address the specific needs for these subgroups. Attendance monitoring for all subgroups that are not proficient will be conducted.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In 2019, 32 percent of students made learning gains in ELA. In 2021, 47 percent of students made learning gains in ELA, an increase of 15 percent. Subgroups; students with disabilities, English language Learners, black/African American students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students all contributed to the improvement.

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

Being able to work with students individually, pulling out lower level students to provide additional strategies and having data chats with students. After school camps were in place to assist all students.

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

Data chats with teachers and students. Lesson planning for acceleration and monitoring students with a focus on students with disabilities, English language Learners, black/African American students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students .

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Unwrapping the standards, staff development on acceleration versus remediation. Staff development on diversity to address the needs of different subgroups; students with disabilities, English language Learners, black/African American students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students.

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

Additional staff to assist students individually and after school tutoring camps to address the needs of all students including all subgroups; students with disabilities, English language Learners, black/African American students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students who are not proficient.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Forty seven percent of students made learning gains in ELA in 2021. This is up from 32 percent in 2019, however, it is still shy of the 50 percent of students required to make learning gains for a school to receive a commendable rating.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, 50 percent of students tested will make learning gains on the ELA state assessment.

Monitoring: Monthly collaborative meetings will be conducted to discuss strategies and progress monitoring of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

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 Steps to Implement

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

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Discipline data for Seagull is not available on SafeSchoolsforAlex.org.

School staff will monitor student behavior as well as discipline data and implement initiatives that target the mental, emotional, and physical health of our students. These programs are designed to fulfill the students' SEL needs in order for them to be successful academically and socially.

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.

Seagull Alternative High School utilizes the services of many community organizations and stakeholders to improve the academic and social emotional welfare of students. Some of the resources, organizations and strategies are as follows:

- Research based mentoring programs (CARES mentoring, Women of Tomorrow and outside agencies)
- One on one peer counseling with certified counselors
- RTI Interventions
- *Individualized attendance intervention
- *Individualized behavior interventions (mentoring, reference to outside agency for behavior management)
- *Individualized academic interventions (peer tutoring, teacher and support staff, intensive reading remediation)
- *Recommended staff/peer mentoring
- *Parent / teacher conferences
- Collaboration with outside agencies including Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), community mental health centers, Healthy Start, and Zeta Phi Beta Stork's Nest.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The administrative team consisting of the principal and assistant principal will work with and designate individuals with key roles to ensure that we are promoting a positive culture and environment. Key members

include: the family counselor, school social worker, literacy coach, ese specialist, guidance counselors and mentor coordinator.

Stakeholders will implement strategies and monitor progress to ensure that we are building and maintaining a positive school culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA				\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0601 - Seagull School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,500.00
Total:						\$2,500.00