

Broward County Public Schools

Deerfield Beach Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Deerfield Beach Middle School

701 SE 6TH AVE, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

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, facilitates 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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

When school events are held including School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings notification is posted on the school website and school marquee. Parent link phone calls are sent home regarding the event/SAC meetings. Parent links also include teachers, leadership and staff members at the school. SAC meetings are announced over the school PA system during morning announcements. The School Improvement Plan is discussed at each SAC meeting in order to include Stakeholder involvement. Sections of the SIP are developed by key stakeholders and each section is discussed at SAC meetings for input. Teacher leaders meet with Administration to monitor and discuss the strategies in the School Improvement Plan and adjust for student success as needed.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan is discussed at School Advisory Council meetings (SAC) with stakeholders. Academic strategies being implemented and discussed in the School Improvement Plan are discussed in Teacher Leadership meetings with administration. Schoolwide Positive Behavior Plan will be discussed with stakeholders and the PBIS team to ensure the student positive behavior plan is being implemented with fidelity.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	90%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)

	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	137	125	355
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	118	68	363
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	26	32	80
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	18	18	53
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	182	172	144	498
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	161	140	122	423
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	197	179	156	532

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	54
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	31	37

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	107	125	341
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	120	86	356
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	10	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	157	163	147	467
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	192	161	186	539
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	331	121	113	565

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	195	196	601

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	59
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	9

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	107	125	341
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	120	86	356
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	10	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	157	163	147	467
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	192	161	186	539
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	331	121	113	565

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	195	196	601

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	59
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	9

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	38	53	49	40	54	50	40		
ELA Learning Gains				48			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			24		
Math Achievement*	39	56	56	35	41	36	31		
Math Learning Gains				50			16		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			18		
Science Achievement*	47	50	49	49	52	53	31		
Social Studies Achievement*	44	67	68	56	63	58	47		
Middle School Acceleration	76	70	73	79	51	49	63		
Graduation Rate					49	49			
College and Career Acceleration					70	70			
ELP Progress	37	42	40	43	74	76	29		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	281
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	4	2
ELL	31	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	41			
HSP	46			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	71			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	45			
HSP	47			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	38			39			47	44	76			37
SWD	15			21			21	12			5	42
ELL	24			25			21	35	43		6	37
AMI												
ASN	73			80							2	
BLK	31			32			38	39	69		6	38
HSP	39			40			47	47	67		6	37
MUL	41			38							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	63			66			73	59	94		5	
FRL	32			34			42	39	66		6	32

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	48	31	35	50	54	49	56	79			43
SWD	14	34	32	9	32	43	9	27				47
ELL	25	38	32	20	46	56	28	45	49			43
AMI												
ASN	80	64		79	77							
BLK	32	44	35	28	44	51	41	52	73			47
HSP	38	46	28	32	52	60	50	53	76			39
MUL	52	65		38	41		64					
PAC												
WHT	71	64	20	68	69	54	65	74	90			
FRL	35	44	27	30	46	53	46	49	74			43

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	35	24	31	16	18	31	47	63			29
SWD	14	25	18	14	18	19	9	16				
ELL	27	33	27	20	15	17	11	41	26			29
AMI												
ASN	94	47		88	50							
BLK	32	31	22	23	13	16	26	41	57			33
HSP	39	35	25	31	19	22	20	52	52			31
MUL	35	22		33	11							
PAC												
WHT	66	50	41	59	21	12	55	68	85			
FRL	35	32	23	27	15	16	27	45	59			36

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	32%	49%	-17%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	49%	-13%	47%	-11%
06	2023 - Spring	30%	50%	-20%	47%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	33%	54%	-21%	54%	-21%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	51%	-16%	48%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	30%	46%	-16%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	30%	38%	-8%	44%	-14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	48%	44%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	46%	44%	48%	42%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	63%	32%	63%	32%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	40%	64%	-24%	66%	-26%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The Data Component form (2021-2022) 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)). Regarding the 2022-2023 SY for FAST testing Raw data has not yet been calculated. Data prior to 2022-2023 SY shows that there were 467 students who were a level 1 on the FSA. Data from the 2022-2023 SY shows that there were 498 students who were a level 1 on the FAST. According to the data there was an increase in Level 1 students. The students were taking a new State test, teacher turnover including new teachers to teaching, and a new book adoption began in the 2021-2022 SY.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is found within our Students with Disabilities, our English Language Learners and proficiency levels in Reading. Data from PM 3 FAST shows that 46% of the students are at a level 1 and 22% of the students are at a level 2. A new state adoption in textbooks began in the 2021-2022 SY and teachers began their training for the new academic materials in the beginning of the 2021-2022 SY. New teachers including teachers new to teaching were also added to the staff and have been working with Mentor teachers and the Reading Coach.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is reading across the grade levels 6, 7, and 8. The State average for percentage in level 3 or above for 6th grade was 47% while the district (Broward) was 50%. The State average for percentage in level 3 or above for 7th grade

was 47% while the district (Broward) was 49%. The state average for percentage in level 3 or above for 8th grade was 47% while the district (Broward) was 49%. As a whole school in the 2022-2023 SY the percentage in level 3 or above was 32%. The 5-year trend in proficiency for reading beginning in the 2019 school year showing a decrease in student proficiency in reading. In 2019, 43% of the students showed proficiency in reading. In 2021, 40% of the students showed proficiency in reading. In 2022, 40% of the students showed proficiency in reading. In 2023, 32% of the students showed proficiency in reading. Students did not test in the 2020 school year due to COVID. The majority of the students did not return to campus during the 2020 school year and elected to learn from home virtually. In the 2021-2022 SY there was a new textbook adoption for ELA classes. Teachers were trained on the new State adopted texts. In the 2022-2023 school year students took the newly adopted FAST state testing. After the 2020 SY some of the teachers didn't come back to campus. There have been turnovers in the Language Arts department during the 2021 SY up to the 2023 SY. New teachers including teachers new to teaching were added to the staff.

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

When analyzing Progress Monitoring (PM) data for FAST, level 1 students decreased from PM 1 to PM 2. PM 1 and PM 2 reading showed 56% of the students at a level 1 for reading. PM 3 showed 45% of the students at level 1. As a whole school Reading Across the Curriculum was being implemented. Teachers received professional development monthly on the new reading strategy being implemented in the classroom. Language Arts teachers received professional development on Learning Stations and began implementing Learning Stations in the classroom. Math also showed a decrease of level 1 students from PM 1 to PM 3. PM 1 math showed 71% of the students to be at level 1. PM 2 math showed 61% of the students to be at level 1. PM 3 math showed 43% of the students to be at level 1. Math teachers received professional development before school began on the new adopted textbook. A textbook representative came to the school to provide professional development regarding the textbook by modeling a lesson in each grade level that all math teachers were invited to. Math teachers were implementing Reading across the classroom. Math teachers kept to an instructional focus calendar to ensure that students received the standards needed to be successful on PM3.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two potential areas of concern on the Early Warning Systems data are Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment and one or more suspensions. Data is showing that prior to the 2022-2023 school year Level 1 students on the statewide ELA assessment was 467 students across 6th, 7th, and 8th grade. The 2022-2023 school year shows that 298 students were Level 1 on the ELA assessment. Prior to the 2022-2023 school year 356 students received one or more suspensions. In the 2022-2023 school year 363 students received one or more suspensions.

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

1. Increase in proficiency levels in Reading for all grade levels (6, 7, and 8).
2. Increase in proficiency levels for SWD for all grade levels (6, 7, and 8).
3. Increase in proficiency levels for ELL for all grade levels (6, 7, and 8).
4. Decrease in suspensions for all grade levels (6, 7, and 8).

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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. Students tested on the FAST test in the 22-23 school year. Raw data is available but not currently calculated. This subgroup will continue to be a focused subgroup based on a three-year trend being below the Federal Index prior to the 22-23 SY FAST testing.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2024, 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 and Math Common Formative Assessments focused on grade level standard lessons, and diagnostics through FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 in Math and Reading. ESE grade level Instructional Support will aide 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:

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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. 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 and Padlet. Math is utilizing Mastery Connect for Common Formative Assessment, allowing students to receive additional remediation in the specific areas of growth that are needed. The Reading and Math departments are incorporating learning stations into the classroom with a small group component as a station. Select student with disabilities (small groups) will be scheduled into a skills class facilitated by an ESE Support Facilitator to aid in Math and Reading skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

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, Common Formative Assessments and Learning Stations.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 will receive remediation via small instructional groups in the core content area classrooms of ELA. SWD 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 such as SuccessMaker for math within the classroom and progress monitoring through FAST PM 1, PM 2 and CFA. Student support is being addressed in pullouts focused on academic support as well as push-ins into the classrooms.

Person Responsible: Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

By When: Students will be monitored during PM 1 and PM 2, CFA's throughout the year and during Extended Learning Opportunities provided after January 2024.

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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. Students tested on the FAST test in the 22-23 school year. Raw data is available but not currently calculated. This subgroup will continue to be a focused subgroup based on being below the Federal Index prior to the 22-23 SY FAST testing.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2024, 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, ELLavate and System 44, ELA Common Formative Assessments through HMH grade level standard lessons, Imagine Learning, SuccessMaker 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 along with the ELL support staff will support ELL teachers and students and provide the appropriate testing and materials needed to evaluate the understanding and achievement levels of our ELL students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 practices, remediation and enrichment for ELL students. ELA teachers are using HMH to gather data through Common Formative Assessment. As a whole school each department is focusing on an ELA strategies (ie; RACE) monthly to better support reading across the school. The reading coach and ELA department chair are supporting teachers with these ELA strategies through Professional Learning Communities and Padlet. Math is utilizing Mastery Connect for Common Formative Assessment, allowing students to receive additional remediation in the specific area of growth that is needed. Students will be able to receive Extended Learning Opportunities to support academics before PM 3 testing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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)

By When: Students will be monitored by Tanya Mays. Students will be monitored during PM 1 and PM 2, CFAs throughout the school year and during Extended Learning Opportunities provided after January 2024.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

There is a three-year trend on the FSA 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)). During the 2023 FAST testing 32% of the students showed to be proficient in Reading for their grade level.

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 proficiency scores will increase to 45% proficiency for the student population as measured by 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 HMH grade level standard lessons, and diagnostics through FAST Progress Monitoring 1, 2, and 3 for Reading. A reading strategy for each 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 Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 practices, remediation and enrichment. ELA teachers are using HMH 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 teachers with these ELA strategies through Professional Learning Communities and Padlet. ELA teachers are implementing learning stations in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Students 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 assessment data.

Person Responsible: Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

By When: Tanya Mays will be overseeing. Students will take PM 1 in September, PM 2 between December and January and PM 3 in May. Students will complete a series of CFA's throughout the year based on grade level standards.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Prior to the 2022-2023 school year 356 students received one or more suspensions. In the 2022-2023 school year 363 students received one or more suspensions. The School Wide Positive Behavior Plan includes an incentive ticket focused on the 10 IB Learner Attributes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

IB Learner Attributes Positive Blue tickets being turned in by students will increase by 50% from 1st to 3rd quarter. The number of referrals for each grade level will decrease 50% from 1st to 3rd quarter. Specifically referrals with students who have received more than 1 referral.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will be conducted through IB Learner Attributes Positive Blue tickets and number of referrals for each grade level. Specifically with students who have received more than 1 referral.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The School Wide Positive Behavior Plan is being implemented to ensure that students are receiving positive incentives for positive behavior decreasing the number of discipline infractions and increasing student academic time in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Focusing on the School Wide Positive Behavior Plan encourages positive behaviors on campus aiding in classroom management and increasing academic time in the classroom.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 quarterly classroom lessons on the Student Expectations. Students will receive Life Skills & Wellness lessons in the classroom. Students will receive administrative presentations focused on student expectations. Staff will award students a blue ticket for positive behaviors that focus on the 10 IB attributes that students can turn in for an incentive prize.

Person Responsible: Michele Matias (michele.matias@browardschools.com)

By When: The blue ticket system is provided to students weekly to encourage positive behaviors on campus. Student expectation lessons, administrative presentations based on positive expectations, and Life Skills & Wellness lessons will be taught throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Each year the principal attends budget meetings and reviews money allocated for school improvement. Money is allocated towards resources that are needed based on the school's budget. During SAC meetings the principal reviews school improvement funding as it pertains to the SIP.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

DBMS disseminate our Title 1 budget plan information to our stakeholders (i.e., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses, and organizations) during our monthly SAC meetings, utilizing our parent link, displaying information on our marquee located at the main entrance of our school and DBMS also shares and disseminate our Title 1 plan through our Jr Buck’s monthly newsletters.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.

List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

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. DBMS strongly encourages parents to meet with their child's teachers regarding any questions and/or concerns of their child's academic and behavior progress. Our teacher/parent conferences are routinely scheduled for Tuesday and Thursday mornings between 7:20 AM - 7:45 AM or afterschool between 2:45-3:00 PM. Additionally, DBMS students receive quarterly interim reports, report cards, FAST PM1, PM2 and PM 3 assessment reports, and teachers sends home data chats reports to inform parents on a regular basis about their child's progress. DBMS implements a yearly customer service survey to parents, staff and students through our District and Title 1 surveys.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

DBMS are utilizing Title 1 funds for staff development. Title 1 funds are used to develop a comprehensive professional training program to improve delivery of instruction through a variety of workshops designed to move teachers to mastery and improved student achievement. DBMS are utilizing both push-in and pull-out model interventions, afterschool tutoring programs, and supplemental resources to help increase our student's overall academic achievement outcome.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

At DBMS our nutritional programs and health education are an integral part of our school, specifically through the Physical Educational curriculum and federal initiatives of the Broward County Public Schools Food & Nutrition Department. Flipany works with our students on a weekly basis to provide activities that encourage healthy nutrition, physical activities, and wellness initiatives. The Staff has started a community garden to teach students about sustainability.

Deerfield Beach Middle school implements the County Student Code of Conduct and follows the District Discipline Matrix. Our school enforces the District's Anti-Bullying Policy and has a zero tolerance for bullying and violence. Bullying prevention programs are supported through Life Skills & Wellness, Peer Counseling/Conflict Mediation programs, guest speakers and student assemblies.

Teachers and staff members are responsible for helping to identify homeless students and referring them to the Homeless Education program (HEART) offered by the district. The purpose of the Homeless Education Program is to identify homeless students, remove barriers to their education, including school enrollment, provide them with supplemental academic and counseling case management services as well as linkages to their school social worker while maintaining school as the students' stable environment.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school has three School Counselors. One per grade level that provide students with counseling and school-based mental health services. School Counselors provide parents with recommended outside counsel agencies when necessary to better support students and parents. The school has a full time Social Worker on campus that works closely with families in need and community stakeholders. The school is assigned a school psychologist and ESE Counselor to better support our SWD and students on Multi-Tiered Support System. Peer Counseling has been added to the school.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The Multi-Tiered Support System is utilized to ensure student with problem behavior or early intervening services are being monitored. Teachers and staff are able to create referrals for students who are exhibiting behavior concerns or who need early intervening services. Once a referral is written the Multi-Tiered Support System Team will gather data from teachers and meet to discuss student data and a plan for student success. The plan is monitored for 6 to 8 weeks and data is gathered by teachers during this time. After the 6 to 8 weeks the Multi-Tiered Support System Team meet to re-evaluate the data and make necessary changes to the plan if needed. BASIS is also monitored for student infractions. Students with multiple infractions or infractions that involve the PROMISE program are add to the Multi-Tiered Support System case load.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional Learning Communities are implemented twice a month. During this time teachers/ paraprofessionals are sharing best practices, Common Formative Assessment Data, and lessons for remediation. Once a month teachers meet with grade level administrators and Reading Coach and receive Professional Development in reading strategies for Reading Across the curriculum. Once a month teachers meet with the International Baccalaureate Magnet Coordinator to receive support and training in the IB philosophy and implementation in the classroom because we are whole IB school. Teachers received professional development during pre-planning on implementing IB philosophy/ strategies into the classroom during teacher workdays. Professional Development is provided for classroom management through CHAMPS and Mastery Connect for Common Formative Assessment.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	N/A	N/A	0911 - Deerfield Beach Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	N/A	N/A	0911 - Deerfield Beach Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	N/A	N/A	0911 - Deerfield Beach Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	N/A	N/A	0911 - Deerfield Beach Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
					Total:	\$12,000.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No