

Broward County Public Schools

Deerfield Beach Middle School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Deerfield Beach Middle School

701 SE 6TH AVE, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Latori Fulton

Start Date for this Principal: 9/18/2018

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (53%)
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	ATSI
* 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Deerfield Beach Middle School

701 SE 6TH AVE, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441

[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>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</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;">90%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	C	C

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.

Deerfield Beach Middle School aims to develop balanced, global thinkers who respect diversity to create a better tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Deerfield Beach Middle School is an inclusive International Baccalaureate school that meets the needs of each student.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fulton, Latori	Principal	Provide instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school: prepare and manage the school's budget and manage and inventory the school's assets; to read, interpret, follow and enforce the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and other state and federal laws; use effective interview techniques, coaching procedures, and evaluation procedures; enforce collective bargaining agreements; use effective public speaking skills, group dynamics, and interaction and problem solving skills; maintain a sensitivity to multicultural issues; perceive the impact of a decision on other components of the organization; communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, and through use of technology; and analyze and use data. The School Principal will need knowledge of current educational trends and research. Knowledge and understanding of the unique needs and characteristics of school system.
Matias, Michele	Assistant Principal	Exhibit the knowledge and practice of current educational trends, research and technology; understand the unique needs, population trends and characteristics of the students served in the school; demonstrate effective communication and interaction skills with all stakeholders; have the ability to use group dynamics within the context of cultural diversity; and be knowledgeable of Florida educational reform, accountability and effective school concepts.
Bennett, Erika	SAC Member	As the SAC Chair, facilities and organizes all SAC meetings ensuring that the School Improvement Plan is discussed at all meetings and that stakeholders have a voice within the school community.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/18/2018, Latori Fulton

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,152

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

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	420	411	461	0	0	0	0	1292
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	107	125	0	0	0	0	341
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	120	86	0	0	0	0	356
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	10	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	157	163	147	0	0	0	0	467
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	192	161	186	0	0	0	0	539
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	331	121	113	0	0	0	0	565

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	210	195	196	0	0	0	0	601

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	59	0	0	0	0	59
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	381	435	414	0	0	0	0	1230
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	111	95	0	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	22	27	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	55	34	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	67	34	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	106	126	0	0	0	0	319
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	103	143	0	0	0	0	326
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	243	254	0	0	0	0	683

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	141	194	199	0	0	0	0	534

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	0	0	0	0	17

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	381	435	414	0	0	0	0	1230
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	111	95	0	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	22	27	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	55	34	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	67	34	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	106	126	0	0	0	0	319
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	103	143	0	0	0	0	326
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	243	254	0	0	0	0	683

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	141	194	199	0	0	0	0	534

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	1	8	8	0	0	0	0	17

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	54%	50%				43%	57%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						54%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						39%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	35%	41%	36%				44%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%						47%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						40%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	52%	53%				42%	49%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	63%	58%				53%	71%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	38%	57%	-19%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	37%	55%	-18%	52%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	59%	-15%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	39%	58%	-19%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	37%	53%	-16%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2022					
	2019	20%	45%	-25%	46%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	13%	43%	-30%	48%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	91%	67%	24%	67%	24%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	49%	71%	-22%	71%	-22%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	89%	61%	28%	61%	28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	56%	44%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	14	34	32	9	32	43	9	27			
ELL	25	38	32	20	46	56	28	45	49		
ASN	80	64		79	77						
BLK	32	44	35	28	44	51	41	52	73		
HSP	38	46	28	32	52	60	50	53	76		
MUL	52	65		38	41		64				
WHT	71	64	20	68	69	54	65	74	90		
FRL	35	44	27	30	46	53	46	49	74		
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	14	25	18	14	18	19	9	16			
ELL	27	33	27	20	15	17	11	41	26		

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
ASN	94	47		88	50						
BLK	32	31	22	23	13	16	26	41	57		
HSP	39	35	25	31	19	22	20	52	52		
MUL	35	22		33	11						
WHT	66	50	41	59	21	12	55	68	85		
FRL	35	32	23	27	15	16	27	45	59		

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	23	46	40	22	40	37	25	33			
ELL	27	50	42	33	46	38	22	46	73		
ASN	96	77		100	92		92		100		
BLK	37	49	35	36	40	37	37	46	77		
HSP	40	55	51	46	50	40	33	53	70		
MUL	56	68		50	36						
WHT	69	70	33	70	71	71	75	74	94		
FRL	39	52	40	40	45	40	38	50	76		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	75
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	45
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	47
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	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The Data Component form showed that the lowest performance was the ESSA Category of SWD (Student with Disabilities) and ELL (English Language Learners). Learning Gains in Reading continues to decrease by 1% for the last three years in the Hispanic subgroup. There is a three year trend within the subgroups of Black, Hispanic, and White students as it pertains to ELA and Math proficiency (Reading Proficiency BLK 37% (2019), 32% (2021), 32% (2022), HSP 40% (2019), 39% (2021), 38% (2022), and WHT 69% (2019), 66% (2021), 71% (2022)) (Math Proficiency BLK 36% (2019), 23% (2021), 28% (2022), HSP 46% (2019), 31% (2021), 32% (2022) and WHT 70% (2019), 59% (2021), 68% (2022)).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest need for improvement is found within our Students with Disabilities, our English Language Learners in Reading, Subgroups BLK and HSP exhibiting proficiency in Reading and Math above 50% in Reading and Math.

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

All students returned to the campus in the 2021-2022 school year after the majority of the students elected to e-learn virtually from home in the 2020-2021 school year. Students were being reacclimated to campus and academic expectations. Students were progress monitored through iReady for Reading and Math three times throughout the year, monitored thru individual growth plans in iReady and academic departments utilized Common Formative Assessments. In the 2022-2023 School Year we will be Progress Monitoring three times a year through FAST. Professional Learning Communities for teachers are centered around curriculum, assessment, remediation and enrichment. Teachers are sharing best practices and discussing data from common formative assessments. Teachers are sharing and reviewing Progress Monitoring data with students to empower students with the knowledge they need to achieve success. Secondary Learning Department assistance is being utilized to better develop and assist teachers towards reaching student achievement in science, Civics and math. ESSR teachers are co-teaching in specific classrooms, tutoring is being offered after school, coaches are pushing into and pulling out of classes to work with students, English Language Learners (ELL) Facilitators are pushing into classrooms to better assist ELL students and teachers, the Collaborative Problem Solving Team is monitoring the Multi-Tiered System of Supports for students academically and behaviorally, a Positive Behavior Plan is being implemented to reduce discipline infractions inside and outside the classroom, Social Emotional Learning is being incorporated into classes, and Extended Learning Opportunities will be offered to students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on progress monitoring through iReady checkpoints, common formative assessments and 2022 state assessments areas showed improvement from the 2021 state assessments. Comparing the 2019 to the 2022 state assessment showed progress in Math Learning Gains 50% 2022, 47% 2019, Math Lowest 25th Percentile 54% 2022, 40% 2019, Science Achievement 49% 2022, 42% (2019), Social Studies Achievement 56% (2022) 53% (2019) ELA Achievement 43% 2022, 40% 2019.

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

Teachers collaborated together during Professional Learning Communities. Teachers evaluated data and shared best practices. Teachers within the grade levels worked on the same lessons to have common formative assessments. The Reading coach collaborated with both the Language Arts teachers and Reading teachers sharing best practices while monitoring iReady data. The Collaborative Problem Solving Team monitored students and communicated the Tier strategies to reading teachers for each student on a Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention. Students had extended learning opportunities to gain extra support in reading and math through pull out sessions throughout the day. Departments worked with District Instructional Facilitators. Science moved to a model of learning stations focused on key standards that showed a need for support through the mid year Benchmark Assessment on Mastery Connect. Students partaking in Biology had extra support based on the midyear assessment and were included in pull outs. Science was focused upon on the 2021 State SIP and showed improvement from the 2019 (43%), 2021 (31%) to 2022 (49%) students showing proficiency.

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

The continued strategy of School Coaches pushing into and pulling out students from classrooms will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning. Learning stations and small teacher led groups being implemented in the classrooms. Common Formative Assessments and Pre-test given to identify students who have reached mastery and can move on within a standard. Sharing best practices and common formative assessment data to better reach student achievement. Extended learning opportunities for students and Professional Learning Development for teachers. Monitoring the FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 and incorporate data chats with students enabling them with the knowledge they need to learn and grow in standards that need remediation.

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.

Professional Development focused on the Florida Best Standards training and the Seasons of Learning provided by the Secondary Learning Department. The Secondary Learning Department Instructional Specialists work at the school within each department to support student achievement and best practices for the teachers. Teachers are also receiving Professional Development for state approved texts including technology software for the texts to monitor student progress and develop individual learning pathways for student growth in reading and math.

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

The additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement is consistent communication with reading and math teachers as it involves students pertaining to Response to Intervention for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. The goal is to close achievement gaps for these individual students or ensure they receive an individual education plan with goals and accommodations for success. Success Maker will be utilized for Common Formative Assessments in math. Into Literature

End of Unit Assessment, growth measure utilizing Read 180 and System 44, and FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 will be utilized to monitor all student growth, grade level standards for remediation or grade level appropriate enrichment in ELA and Reading. Mastery Connect is being used to measure common formative assessment in Science, ELA, and Civics. Secondary Learning assessments in CANVAS will continue to be used in Science and Civics. ESSR teachers have been infused into the school culture to aide in the support of Language Arts and Math. ESSR teachers co-teach with other teachers within Language Arts and Math ensuring best practice are being utilized within the classroom.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The Federal Index for our Students with Disabilities was at 27% for the 21/22 school year. Our DBMS Students With Disabilities Subgroup was below 41% for three consecutive years and below 32% for one year.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By June of 2023, Students With Disabilities (SWD) will be at a rate at or above 41% FPPI.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be monitored through growth measure Read 180 and System 44, ELA Common Formative Assessments through Mastery Connect grade level standard lessons, Success Maker Math Common Formative Assessments, diagnostics through FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 in Math and Reading. ESE grade level Instructional Support will aid in the monitoring of ESE students within their caseload. Teachers will provide the necessary accommodations as it pertains to individual education plans for each student to ensure the achievement gap is decreased and students are showing an improvement in growth and learning gains as it pertains to grade level standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erika Bennett (erika.bennett@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Students are placed into appropriate reading classes based on the district reading tree and students' State Assessment scores in reading. Teachers are collaborating during Profession Learning Communities and analyzing Common Formative Assessment data to better share best practice, remediation and enrichment. ELA teachers are using Mastery Connect to gather data through Common Formative Assessment. As a whole school each department is focusing on a ELA strategy (ie; RACE) monthly to better support reading across the school. The reading coach and ELA department teacher are supporting teachers with these ELA strategies through Professional Learning Communities and

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Padlet. Math is utilizing Success Maker for Common Formative Assessment, allowing student to receive additional remediation in the specific areas of growth that are needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are able to be monitored throughout lessons and receive growth/feedback based on learned standards/standards needed for remediation through FAST Progress Monitoring and Common Formative Assessments.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

SWD Students will receive remediation via small instructional groups in the core content area classrooms of Reading/ELA. SWD students will receive small group instruction in the core content area classrooms of mathematics. Student will receive Reading, ELA, and math remediation within the classroom via technology software related to state adopted textbooks within the classroom and progress monitoring through FAST PM 1 and PM 2.

Person Responsible

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The Federal Index for our English Language Learners (ELL) was at 38% for the 21/22 school year. Our DBMS Students With Disabilities Subgroup was below 41% for one consecutive year.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By June of 2023, will be at a rate at or above 41% FPPI.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be monitored through growth measure Read 180 and System 44, ELA Common Formative Assessments through Mastery Connect grade level standard lessons, Success Maker Math Common Formative Assessments, diagnostics through FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 in Math and Reading. ELL Instructional Support will aide in the monitoring of ELL students within the classroom. Teachers will provide the necessary ELL learning strategies for each student to ensure the achievement gap is decreased and students are showing an improvement in growth and learning gains as it pertains to grade level standards. The ELL Liaison will support ELL teachers and students and provide the appropriate testing and materials needed to evaluate English language understanding and achievement levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Students are placed into appropriate classes based on the ACCESS ELL test scores in English Language comprehension/proficiency. Teachers are collaborating during Profession Learning Communities and analyzing Common Formative Assessment data to better share best practice, remediation and enrichment for ELL students. ELA teachers are using Mastery Connect to gather data through Common Formative Assessment. As a whole school each department is focusing on an ELA strategy (ie; RACE) monthly to better support reading across the school. The reading coach and ELA department teacher are supporting teachers with these ELA strategies through Professional Learning Communities

implemented for this Area of Focus.

and Padlet. Math is utilizing Success Maker for Common Formative Assessment, allowing students to receive additional remediation in the specific area of growth that is needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are able to be monitored throughout lessons and receive growth/feedback based on learned standards/standards needed for remediation through FAST Progress Monitoring and Common Formative Assessments.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

ELL Students will receive remediation via small instructional groups in the core content area classrooms of Reading/ELA. ELL students will receive small group instruction in the core content area classrooms of mathematics. Students will be assisted with ELL Instructional Support members in the classroom. Students are scheduled into classes in order to meet their English proficiency needs within the classroom.

Person Responsible

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

There is a three year trend within the subgroups of Black, Hispanic, and White students as it pertains to Math proficiency (Math Proficiency BLK 36% (2019), 23% (2021), 28% (2022), HSP 46% (2019), 31% (2021), 32% (2022) and WHT 70% (2019), 59% (2021), 68% (2022)).

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

The goal for the 2022-2023 School Year is by May 2023, the percentage of proficient students in will increase from 35% to 40% in math as measured by the FAST Assessment PM 3.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be monitored through Success Maker Math Common Formative Assessments, and diagnostics through FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Students are placed into appropriate math classes based on the students' State Assessment scores in math. Teachers are collaborating during Profession Learning Communities and analyzing Common Formative Assessment data to better share best practices, remediation and enrichment. Math teachers are using Success Maker to gather data through Common Formative Assessment. The math coach and math department teacher are supporting math teachers with math strategies through Professional Learning Communities and Professional Development regarding the State adopted math textbook and online features. Math is utilizing Success Maker for Common Formative Assessments

implemented for this Area of Focus. allowing students to receive additional remediation in the specific area of growth that is needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are able to be monitored throughout lessons and receive growth/feedback based on learned standards/standards needed for remediation through FAST Progress Monitoring and Common Formative Assessments.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students will receive remediation via small instructional groups in the core content area classrooms of Math. Student will receive math remediation within the classroom via technology software related to state adopted textbooks within the classroom and progress monitoring through FAST PM 1 and PM 2. Teachers will conduct data chats with students as it pertains to FAST PM 1 and PM 2. The math coach will conduct pull outs based on student common formative assessment data. Students will be given extended learning opportunities in math based on student common formative assessment data.

Person Responsible

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

There is a three year trend within the subgroups of Black, Hispanic, and White students as it pertains to ELA proficiency (Reading Proficiency BLK 37% (2019), 32% (2021), 32% (2022), HSP 40% (2019), 39% (2021), 38% (2022), and WHT 69% (2019), 66% (2021), 71% (2022)).

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The smart goal for the 2022-2023 School Year is by June 2023, Language Arts Reading & Writing scores will increase by 3-5% in proficient & non-proficient students as measured by the school wide Growth Measure Assessment and the school wide FAST PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be monitored through growth measure Read 180 and System 44, ELA Common Formative Assessments through Mastery Connect grade level standard lessons, and diagnostics through FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 for Reading. Reading strategy for the month across the curriculums is being implemented to support Reading/ELA standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Students are placed into appropriate reading classes based on the district reading tree and students' State Assessment scores in reading. Students are scheduled into appropriate ELA classes based on State Assessment scores. Teachers are collaborating during Profession Learning Communities and analyzing Common Formative Assessment data to better share best practices, remediation and enrichment. ELA teachers are using Mastery Connect to gather data through Common Formative Assessment. As a whole school each department is focusing on an ELA strategy (ie; RACE) monthly to better support reading across the school. The reading coach and ELA/Reading Department Chairs are supporting

implemented for this Area of Focus.

teachers with these ELA strategies through Professional Learning Communities and Padlet.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students are able to be monitored throughout lessons and receive growth/feedback based on learned standards/standards needed for remediation through FAST Progress Monitoring and Common Formative Assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students will receive remediation via small instructional groups in the core content area classrooms for ELA. Student will receive ELA/Reading remediation within the classroom via technology software related to state adopted textbooks within the classroom and progress monitoring through FAST PM 1 and PM 2. Teachers will conduct data chats with students as it pertains to FAST PM 1 and PM 2. The reading coach will conduct pull outs based on student common formative assessment. Students will be given extended learning opportunities in ELA/Reading based on student common formative data.

Person

Responsible

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Monthly and quarterly student, parent and community forum events are planned and hosted for our parents. During which time, our school shares resources that are aligned with our vision and mission goals and bringing high quality resources to our parents.

Deerfield Beach Middle School's (DBMS) Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) approach is holistic, looking

at the whole child (academically, personally, and socially). Our school-wide initiative and mission is for all staff and parents to have the knowledge and communication of resources available at school and/or in the community to meet individual students' needs, as well as their families when applicable. DBMS SEL committee works collaboratively to inform our staff, parents, and families to acknowledge and know their rights to resources and assistance for help with advocacy academically and mental health alike.

DBMS is an International Baccalaureate (IB) school that embraces and teaches the philosophy of IB Profile Learner Attributes to all DBMS students (Inquires, Knowledgeable, Thinkers, Communicators, Open-Minded, Caring, Risk-Takers, Balanced, and Reflective) to ensure a positive school culture on campus. School Counseling, Family Counselor, and a School Social Worker are available to students/parents through a referral process.

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

Social and Emotional Learning (SEL Committee) Lessons focused on 5 SEL Competencies, 10 Minutes of Mindfulness and SEL for teachers: Michele Matias, Ruchelle Lane, Juanita Kears-Creech and DBMS PTSA.

School Wide Positive Behavior Plan IB Learner Profile Tickets, Jr. Bucks, Social and Emotional Learning, Discipline Strategies in the classroom, and monitoring School Referrals for CPST: PBIS Committee members-Michele Matias, Richelle Fearon.

Teacher Leaders Facilitate Professional Learning Communities, engage in school-wide data, provide Professional Development to teachers/staff, provide support to teachers within their departments and provide parent information sessions throughout the school year: Latori Fulton, Michele Matias, Leslie Pickett, Carlton Jackson, Ruchelle Lane, Shamika Hoskins, Gidette Augustin, Richelle Fearon, Derwin Moore, Suzy Pinnell, Nicole Brown, Brigitte Collins, Marcia Werle, Erika Bennett, and Raphine Rachels.

Administration develops a school culture that is inviting, supportive and educational for all stakeholders: Latori Fulton, Michele Matias, Leslie Pickett and Carlton Jackson.

Parent/Teacher/Student Association is supportive of initiatives throughout the school and help in promoting a positive culture and environment throughout campus. Supports schoolwide initiatives such as prizes for students who receive IB Learner Profile Tickets for showing positive behavioral attributes and working with partners to supply goods for the quarterly Staff Appreciation Caring Carts.

School Advisory Counsel creates an environment that is welcoming for all stakeholders to meet and discuss the needs of the school as well as review/discuss the School Improvement Plan: Michele Matias, Erika Bennett, and Dr. Juanita Kears-Creech.

Equity plan is put into place to ensure that the school environment is equitable for all stakeholders and promotes a positive school culture: Gidette Augustin.