

Broward County Public Schools

Coral Springs Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Coral Springs Middle School

10300 WILES RD, Coral Springs, FL 33076

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sara La Rosa

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2018

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Coral Springs Middle school is to educate our students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Coral Springs Middle is focused on providing every student with rigorous, relevant, and enriching experiences that allow students to reach their maximum potential and prepare them for high school and beyond.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
La Rosa, Sara	Principal	Principal oversees administrative team and their respective duties as well as the safety and security of the campus.
Argent, David	Assistant Principal	Job duties and responsibilities include overseeing the teacher evaluations and instruction in Math and Elective courses as well as supervising Security Staff and Facilities. Additionally, Mr. Argent's areas of responsibility expand to the bell schedule, Smart Bond initiative, Student Services, Property & Inventory, Security and Safety drills and measures, Matriculation from Elementary school, PTA/SAF/SAC, Facility Leases, Staff Recognition, Technology programs or issues, Business Partnerships, Food Services Liaison, and EEO Liaison.
Matthews, Roxana	Assistant Principal	Job duties and responsibilities include overseeing the teacher evaluations and instruction in Science and English Language Arts courses, as well as supervising the Clerical staff. Additionally, Mrs. Matthew's responsibilities expand to oversee all Athletics and extracurricular activities calendar and approvals, ESOL, Guidance and Testing, Professional Development, Service Staff, the master schedule, matriculation to high school, Course Recovery, Internal Suspension, Naviance, Open House events, Positive Behavior Plan, SEL Initiatives, Substitutes, Student Incentives, and TIER Program for new educators.
Daniel, Tangela	Assistant Principal	Job duties and responsibilities include overseeing the teacher evaluations and instruction in Reading and Social Studies courses, ESLS teachers and facilitators, as well as supervising the ESLS staff/paraprofessionals. Additionally, Dr. Daniel's responsibilities expand to oversee all Safety/Security, ESE - IEP/504 Plan maintenance and implementation, Title 1, Matriculation from 6th grade, Student Attendance, MTSS/CPST/RTI, Clinic, Grants, Hero system implementation and follow-up, Marquee, Monthly Heritage activities, Parent Communication, Transportation issues, Textbooks and Media, Volunteers/Mentors.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/25/2018, Sara La Rosa

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

28

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

36

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	320	327	398	0	0	0	0	1045
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	13	20	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	62	57	0	0	0	0	160
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	19	62	0	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	36	60	0	0	0	0	137
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	36	70	0	0	0	0	146

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/30/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	389	413	405	0	0	0	0	1207
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	51	58	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	85	105	0	0	0	0	278
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	24	37	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	95	106	0	0	0	0	284

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	55	60	80	0	0	0	0	195

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	2	6	14	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	3	3	0	0	0	0	18

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	389	413	405	0	0	0	0	1207
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	51	58	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	85	105	0	0	0	0	278
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	24	37	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	95	106	0	0	0	0	284

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	55	60	80	0	0	0	0	195

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	2	6	14	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	3	3	0	0	0	0	18

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	64%	57%	54%	61%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	57%	54%	56%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	48%	47%	49%	50%	47%
Math Achievement	64%	60%	58%	63%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%	58%	57%	60%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	49%	51%	45%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	49%	51%	51%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	71%	72%	86%	72%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	60%	57%	3%	54%	6%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	61%	55%	6%	52%	9%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	51%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	65%	59%	6%	56%	9%
	2018	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	59%	58%	1%	55%	4%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	61%	53%	8%	54%	7%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	30%	45%	-15%	46%	-16%
	2018	51%	47%	4%	45%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	41%	43%	-2%	48%	-7%
	2018	50%	45%	5%	50%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	67%	31%	67%	31%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	71%	15%	71%	15%
2018	84%	70%	14%	71%	13%
Compare		2%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	61%	35%	61%	35%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	95%	63%	32%	62%	33%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	56%	44%	57%	43%
2018	100%	51%	49%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	39	36	25	35	28	24	59	45		
ELL	43	50	42	44	55	48	31	74	62		
ASN	91	74		89	78		95	100	100		
BLK	50	47	37	47	48	32	31	81	71		
HSP	58	56	49	58	56	49	51	87	70		
MUL	79	72		64	56		65	86	73		
WHT	75	64	44	79	67	52	64	91	87		
FRL	52	51	38	48	48	36	38	81	65		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	39	39	21	43	40	17	52			
ELL	34	54	56	46	61	50	33	76	36		
ASN	83	78		88	81	64	76	100	96		
BLK	50	52	50	49	52	42	40	78	58		
HSP	54	49	43	60	59	49	42	80	59		
MUL	67	51		68	58	33	50	100			
WHT	72	62	50	76	66	51	64	92	68		
FRL	51	52	48	52	56	44	42	79	60		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	624
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	90
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	49
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	61
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	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component showing the lowest performance was the Lowest 25% for both Math and English Language Arts. These components are both in the 40s, whereas every other data area is 50 percent and higher. For ELA, there are Intensive Reading courses for students scoring a Level 1 or 2. However, Level 1 and 2 students were collectively grouped into Intensive Reading courses, which focused mostly on comprehension rather than foundational reading areas (phonics, fluency). It is up to the individual reading teacher to corral students with foundational reading deficits into small learning groups on a daily basis. Additionally, with such a spectrum of needs in the intensive reading courses, personalization of needs proved to be difficult. In Math, Level 1 and 2 students are in core courses. There is no Intensive Mathematics course; students are provided with remediation materials from the textbook resources.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is the proficiency level of 8th grade Math going from 51% to 30% scoring Level 3 or higher on the FSA Math. One factor which greatly contributed to this decline was a strategic push to encourage many Level 2 students to take Algebra 1. This selected group of Level 2 Math students were placed in an Algebra course and provided remedial support throughout the course. These students did very well in Algebra, but were not part of our testing population for FSA Math. These students contributed to our Acceleration points as part of our school grade, but this adversely effected our 8th grade Math proficiency and overall Math proficiency score.

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 compared to the state average is our 7th grade Civics data. The state shows 71% proficiency and our school shows 86%. Our Civics teachers are given time to collaborate and fine tune their instructional practices. They incorporate many reading strategies into their lessons and they are provided with additional resources and do not solely rely on the district-adopted textbook. It is all these factors combined with much dedication that our teachers are able to garner such promising results for proficiency in Civics.

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

The data component showing the most improvement from 2018 to 2019 was seventh grade ELA, gaining 7% in proficiency. The only new actions taken in this grade level was the incorporation of regularly assigning NewsELA passages which expose students to similar questioning to what they experience on the FSA. Additionally, in 2018 the seventh grade had an unusual number of students who received a zero on the writing portion of the FSA; teachers incorporated scored examples into their writing instruction and thus only 7 students recieved a score of zero.

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

From our current year's EWS data, the number of students scoring a Level 1 on Reading or Math is concerning. The level one's in Reading account for 13% of the student population and the level one's in Math account for 14%. The number of level ones is greatest in the 8th grade in both areas. Additionally, the number of current failures in ELA and Math classes is concerning. Although the tally of these failures as of Sept. 30th is fluid as the first marking period has not yet completed and there are still more weeks in which these grades can improve.

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

1. Lowest 25% / Students with Disabilities
2. Literacy
3. Safety and Security
4. Positive Behavior Incentives

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities, who mostly fall into the subgroup of the Lowest 25% are our most fragile learners, needing the most support in order to succeed and make gains. Our area of focus is to seek learning gains for the lowest quartile of students in both math and reading. The ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities, is the only group of Coral Springs Middle School students who fall below the FPPI.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sara La Rosa (sara.larosa@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategies utilized to assist our lowest 25% of reading students will involve the incorporation of the foundational literacy programs, Just Words and REWARDS. Intensive reading courses will also be tiered based on the varying needs of our students (as measured by the FAIR, Graded word lists, and Oral Reading Fluency probes), rather than all Level 1 and 2 students being grouped solely by that factor. Additionally, we will offer after school camps in both Math, ELA, Civics, and Science that focus on standards-based instruction to supplement the instruction taking place during the school day. Although all students are welcome to attend, the lowest 25% will be targeted to attend these sessions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students in Intensive Reading courses vary according to their individual needs. Some students will require the Just Words program, where individual sounds are being blended. Whereas some students are beyond that level and struggle at a 3rd or 4th grade level and need multisyllabic word attack skills, and would benefit from the REWARDS program. Other students merely need fluency and comprehension practice. By sorting the Intensive Reading courses according to these needs, we believe we will strongly support our most needy readers. By offering supplemental after school sessions in both ELA and Math, we seek to further support our students in succeeding academically. Additionally, with the acquisition of the i-ready program, students will be able to receive personalized instruction to aid in their learning deficits as defined by the program's diagnostic assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Foundational reading instruction within Intensive Reading Courses

Person Responsible Donna DeStefano (donna.destefano@browardschools.com)

2. . Extended Learning Opportunities- before/after school academic camps

Person Responsible Sara La Rosa (sara.larosa@browardschools.com)

3. Intervention implementation of i-ready program in Reading courses

Person Responsible Tangela Daniel (tangela.daniel@browardschools.com)

4. Intervention implementation of i-ready program in Math courses

Person Responsible David Argent (david.argent@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Literacy, the ability to read, write, and comprehend language in order to communicate ideas, is the cornerstone of learning and an essential component of all curricular areas. At Coral Springs Middle, we seek continuous improvement in the area of Literacy for all of our students. Currently students scoring at Level 1 on the Florida Standards Assessment in Reading account for 13% of our student population.

Measureable Outcome: By June 2021, the percentage of CSMS students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 64% to 67% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in English Language Arts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sara La Rosa (sara.larosa@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Independent reading that expands beyond the classroom will foster reading stamina, fluency, and comprehension. Our students lack of reading stamina is evidenced by 86% of 7th graders being proficient on the Civics exam, but only 61% of those same students being proficient on the FSA ELA test. The FSA ELA consists of lengthy and often multiple passages, differing greatly from the Civics exam where the amount of text is significantly less. However, both assessments pose rigorous questioning. Silent sustained reading programs create not only life long readers, but highly literate individuals (according to ASCD). Additionally, writing conferences and the use of i-ready will be strategies utilized to enhance ELA instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order for Coral Springs Middle to increase Literacy proficiency in all students, we will first ensure all ELA teachers define their independent reading expectation and choose a form of accountability to measure independent reading. Teachers will continue to monitor grade level expectations through standards-based common formative assessments and school-wide writing simulations. Following school-wide writing simulations, teachers will be provided with a substitute teacher to cover his/her classes for two school days in order to conduct one on one writing conferences with individual students. The ability to conference with students about their personal writing needs and goals will significantly aid in their writing development. Additionally, students who are deemed off-track (not reading on grade level) according to the i-ready reading diagnostic, will utilize their personalized pathway of lessons in the area of Reading.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher - student writing conferences

Person Responsible Roxana Matthews (rmatthews@browardschools.com)

2. Intervention implementation of i-ready program in ELA courses

Person Responsible Roxana Matthews (rmatthews@browardschools.com)

3. Independent reading reading expectations throughout ELA courses.

Person Responsible Donna DeStefano (donna.destefano@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Additionally, in order to maintain a positive learning environment and encourage students to make wise academic and social choices, school leadership team deems rewarding, acknowledging, and incentivizing wise choices by students as a priority. The school leadership team often seeks donations from business partners and parent groups in order to provide varying incentives for various initiatives.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Coral Springs Middle continues to build a positive school culture by building, maintaining, and improving upon relationships with all stakeholders. Parental and community involvement are crucial to all successful educational programs and CSMS takes varying steps and initiatives to maintain an open door policy, be welcoming and inviting to all, encourage participation at any level, as well as elicit the needs of our stakeholders and be responsive to such needs. This involves the collaborative and often overlapping measures of many groups and individuals, such as the Title 1 Liaison, the social workers, the school resource officer, the Literacy Coach, the Guidance counselors, and parent organizations to say a few. On campus our admin, teachers, and staff are visible, approachable and interacting with all. After hours and during virtual learning, our newsletters, website, and weekly calls from the principal are key in keeping up with varying events, resources, and information. Our monthly School Advisory Council meetings as well as Parent Teacher Association meetings are excellent avenues to voice concerns, ask questions, or just be in the know of every initiative and decision which impacts CSMS.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$8,816.00
---	--------	---	------------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			2561 - Coral Springs Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$8,816.00
			<i>Notes: Salary stipend for teachers to conduct extended learning opportunity camps</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$16,783.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			2561 - Coral Springs Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$16,783.00
			<i>Notes: Salaries for substitute teachers in order for ELA teachers to conduct one-on-one writing conferences with students and for additional subject area teachers to attend professional development sessions focused on literacy strategies and initiatives.</i>			
					Total:	\$25,599.00