

Broward County Public Schools

Sea Castle Elementary School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sea Castle Elementary School

9600 MIRAMAR BLVD, MIRAMAR, FL 33025

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: LaTonya Cooper

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (59%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sea Castle Elementary School

9600 MIRAMAR BLVD, MIRAMAR, FL 33025

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">76%</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;">98%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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.

At Sea Castle Elementary we are fostering a Growth Mindset environment where all scholars achieve their B.E.S.T.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are Sea Castle! We put forth maximum effort. We believe everything is possible with P.R.I.D.E!
Persevere with Respect, Integrity, and Discipline in Everything we do!

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
Rodriguez, Riquelme	Principal	Mr. Rodriguez is responsible for providing instructional leadership and managing all aspects of the school environment (operational, budget, community involvement, etc).
Lopez, Leila	School Counselor	Ms. Lopez is responsible for addressing the Social/Emotional needs of the school community. She provides on site behavior support and assists with the monitoring of MTSS initiatives.
Stewart, Sharlene	Instructional Coach	Ms. Sharlene Stewart is responsible for providing on site 3-5 ELA and Math coaching and ELA and Math curriculum support to classroom teachers and students via modeling effective instructional strategies.
Catalano, Maria	Instructional Coach	Ms. Catalano is responsible for providing on site K-2nd ELA and Math coaching and ELA and Math curriculum support to classroom teachers and students via modeling effective instructional strategies.
Stewart, Cherryl	Teacher, ESE	As our Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Specialist, Ms. Stewart coordinates all required ESE meetings. She assists regular education teachers of students with disabilities to implement the Individual Education Plan, (IEP) and monitor progress of IEP Goals.
Henao, Maria	Other	Ms. Henao, the Autism Coach she support students and teachers in the self-contained programs for autism and the general education teachers that support students with autism. She supports teachers and staff in development of their teaching skills, behavioral autism instructional support, and classroom environment.
Kerkerian, Gina	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Kerkerian is responsible for providing instructional leadership and managing all aspects of the school environment (operational, budget, community involvement, etc).

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2010, LaTonya Cooper

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.*

6

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

821

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

6

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

6

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	131	129	137	130	158	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	806
Attendance below 90 percent	19	19	32	29	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	25	43	40	48	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196

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	3	10	19	17	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	3	6	14	12	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/28/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	131	129	137	130	158	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	806
Attendance below 90 percent	19	19	32	29	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	10	19	17	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	3	6	14	12	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				63%	59%	57%	58%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	60%	58%	64%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	54%	53%	65%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	65%	63%	62%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				76%	66%	62%	65%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	53%	51%	49%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	46%	53%	52%	49%	55%

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	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	62%	-2%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	66%	59%	7%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	65%	2%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	67%	-5%	64%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	49%	-1%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

All students in grades K through 5, used Curriculum Associates, iReady Tutorial Program for progress monitoring.

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		46/42.2	60/50.8	73/59.8
	Economically Disadvantaged		31/38.3	40/48.2	54/62.1
	Students With Disabilities		8/47.1	12/63.2	8/38.1
	English Language Learners		1/7.7	2/10.5	5/25.0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		34/29.8	39/32.5	53/44.2
	Economically Disadvantaged		23/28.0	24/28.2	38/43.7
	Students With Disabilities		8/44.4	11/55.0	7/41.2
	English Language Learners		6/31.6	3/14.3	7/31.8

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38/31.1	63/50.0	72/57.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/28.6	43/42.2	53/52.0
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.3	8/33.3	6/28.6
	English Language Learners	3/20.0	3/18.8	8/42.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15/12.3	30/23.6	39/31.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/13.3	20/19.6	27/27.0
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.5	4/16.7	5/26.3
	English Language Learners	1/6.3	3/16.7	4/20.0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60/50.4	67/55.8	78/63.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/44.1	46/49.5	55/59.1
	Students With Disabilities	7/29.2	9/36.0	9/40.9
	English Language Learners	1/9.1	2/5.4	3/21.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16/13.3	39/32.8	48/46.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/9.7	26/28.0	32/41.0
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	6/24.0	6/33.3
	English Language Learners	1/8.3	1/7.7	2/18.2

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45/31.3	69/46.6	71/48.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/28.7	55/46.6	54/46.2
	Students With Disabilities	2/6.3	4/12.1	6/18.2
	English Language Learners	0/0.0	5/31.3	4/23.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19/13.4	51/34.7	71/48.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/12.4	39/33.3	56/49.1
	Students With Disabilities	1/3.2	4/12.5	9/28.1
	English Language Learners	0/0.0	6/37.5	7/38.9
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36/32.7	50/44.6	55/48.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/31.1	38/41.3	43/46.7
	Students With Disabilities	4/14.8	6/22.2	7/25.9
	English Language Learners	0/0.0	1/10.0	0/0.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36/32.4	51/45.9	69/64.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/30.8	41/45.1	53/61.6
	Students With Disabilities	6/22.2	10/37.0	10/38.5
	English Language Learners	1/10.0	3/30.0	3/33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
Economically Disadvantaged				
Students With Disabilities				
English Language Learners				

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	19	57	92	29	32	23	26				
ELL	31	67		48	56		41				
ASN	46			57							
BLK	50	53	73	43	42	28	38				
HSP	47	65		39	50		38				
FRL	46	57	77	40	47	32	40				
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	30	54	58	48	57	47	34				
ELL	49	59	80	81	80	83	65				
ASN	71	69		94	92						
BLK	63	66	54	64	73	56	47				
HSP	65	71	87	78	83	80	53				
FRL	60	67	59	67	76	60	46				
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	31	44	50	34	44	35	15				
ELL	59	82	80	68	63						
ASN	64			93							
BLK	56	62	67	59	65	45	53				
HSP	70	68	50	70	63	50	52				
WHT	25			58							
FRL	57	64	66	62	64	45	51				

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	50
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	49
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Student proficiency levels have been consistent but learning gains have not.

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

Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th Percentile both showed the greatest decline from last year. They both decline almost 50%.

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

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state is the Math Learning gains. There was 53% gap. Factors contributing to this gap is lack of rigorous standard based instruction by teachers.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement. Our Literacy Coach facilitated the ELA Professional Learning Communities with an emphasis on creating standards-based rigorous lessons and activities.

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

Professional Learning Communities have contributed to the gains.

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

1. Teacher Development in Instructional Practices
2. Teacher Development in the creation of standards-based lessons, activities and class assignments
3. Progress monitoring of student achievement
4. Progress monitoring of our MTSS
5. Strengthen the school-home connection

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.

Understanding Florida Standards and Improved Teaching Strategies.

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

PLC's and PD Opportunities.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Teachers continue to need professional development on delivering high quality instruction in increase student achievement, technology integration and implement rigorous, standards-aligned instruction, and lessons.

Measurable Outcome: Teachers will deliver high quality instruction to increase student achievement and reach our school goals of:
 ELA - 57% Proficient
 ELA Learning Gains - 69%
 ELA Lowest Quartile Gains - 69%
 Math - 61% Proficient
 Math Learning Gains - 66%
 Math Lowest Quartile Gains - 63%
 Science - 48% Proficient

Monitoring: Monitoring will take place via the following formats: Classroom observations; Student Common Formative Assessment Data Collection; Teacher and Administration Data Analysis Meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Riquelme Rodriguez (rrodriguez@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The implementation of explicit and systematic standards-based instruction to increase student achievement in ELA, Math, and Science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The teachers need professional development on standards-based instruction to ensure that their instructions are aligned to the ELA and MATH shifts linked to the FSA Standards. Teachers will then be able to determine their students' specific weaknesses and strengths per standard covered, and they will used evidence based strategies in order to inform their daily instruction. The teachers will analyze the data per student based on performance levels (deficient, struggling, proficient) and remediation and enrichment activities will be assigned based on each student's performance on the assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership team will collect and analyze student achievement data to identify areas of strengths and weakness.
2. Based on areas of weaknesses, the leadership team will collaborate with teachers to implement research-based strategies and interventions needed to address areas of weakness while continuing to develop strengths.
3. Teachers will implement the balance literacy program and interventions during their ELA instructional block, differentiating instruction to meet the needs of students.
4. Schedule daily push-out and push-in into ELA and Math support (Resource Teacher) assigned to lowest quartile students in grades three, four and five.
5. Extended Learning Opportunities 3 days weekly for 24 weeks, to provide remedial instruction in ELA, Science and Math.
6. Administration will procure additional resources (if necessary) through District resources, school budget resources, grants and partnerships.
7. Professional Learning Communities will center on the implementation of writing, BAS calibration, whole group instructional practices of Balanced Literacy Program and Guided Reading Groups.
8. Teachers will receive professional development in small group instruction, guided reading, quality math

instruction and quality science instruction.

9. Curriculum Associates, iReady Site Licenses, iReady Toolbox, LAFS and MAFS will allow teachers to support students through the implementation of high quality instructional materials and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Riquelme Rodriguez (rrodriguez@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.

Sea Castle Elementary School reported 0 incidents per 100 students.

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.

The school builds and sustains partnerships by:

1. Provide high-quality instruction for our students and increase collaboration and communication with our parents and community through, but limited to parent letters, telephone calls, emails, quarterly parent nights and parent conferences to support the family and the student.
2. Providing on site wrap around services in the form of a Part-time school social worker.
3. Partnering with community and business partners to provide parent engagement events.

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

Parents, Business Partners, Teachers and Faculty meet monthly and discuss creating a positive environment at the School Advisory Committee Meeting.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$24,871.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	2871 - Sea Castle Elementary School	General Fund		\$5,520.00
			<i>Notes: Student classroom instructional supplies: Purchase composition books, pencils, sharpeners, ink pens, paper, dry erase markers, white boards and glue for students to use daily.</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	2871 - Sea Castle Elementary School	General Fund		\$19,351.00
			<i>Notes: Heinemann's Fountas LLI Red, Blue and Green Kits designed to provide remediation and intervention support for students in grades 1-3 in ELA as well as support small group instruction. These kits will reinforce reading fluency and reading comprehension. - Leveled Literacy Intervention kits (Grade 1) - Leveled Literacy Intervention kits (Grade 2) - Leveled Literacy Intervention kits (Grade 3).</i>			
					Total:	\$24,871.00