

Broward County Public Schools

# Stirling Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>16</b> |

# Stirling Elementary School

5500 STIRLING RD, Hollywood, FL 33021

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Jacqueline Arnaez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (54%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)<br>2016-17: C (42%)<br>2015-16: C (46%)<br>2014-15: B (56%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>16</b> |

## Stirling Elementary School

5500 STIRLING RD, Hollywood, FL 33021

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 79%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 77%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       | 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.

Stirling Elementary School's mission is to academically and socially prepare all students by promoting intensive academic and behavioral programs in a changing, diverse society. We will strive to meet these challenges through data-driven intervention programs, improving academic areas in all subgroups, prioritizing school safety, and increasing our commitment to parental and community involvement.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Stirling Elementary School's vision is that all students will exemplify positive character traits, outstanding behavior, and strive for academic excellence.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name               | Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------------|------------|--|
| Arnaez, Jacqueline | Principal  | Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable and measurable for all groups of students. |
| Argibay, Tanya     | SAC Member | Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan.   |

### 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     | 83          | 100 | 95 | 94 | 92 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 568   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 7           | 12  | 11 | 5  | 5  | 9   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 14 | 8   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |

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 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

**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     | 1           | 4 | 11 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 1  | 0 | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

29

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/27/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Attendance below 90 percent     |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |
| One or more suspensions         |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |

**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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 21          | 8 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 88    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0  | 26 | 35 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 92    |

**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 | 1           | 1 | 2 | 10 | 29 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 73    |



## 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             | 57%    | 59%      | 57%   | 44%    | 55%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 60%    | 60%      | 58%   | 48%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 45%    | 54%      | 53%   | 43%    | 53%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 57%    | 65%      | 63%   | 46%    | 61%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 64%    | 66%      | 62%   | 45%    | 63%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47%    | 53%      | 51%   | 38%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 45%    | 46%      | 53%   | 33%    | 45%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |        |        |        |         | Total   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5       |         |
| Number of students enrolled     | 83 (0)                            | 100 (0) | 95 (0) | 94 (0) | 92 (0) | 104 (0) | 568 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 7 ( )                             | 12 ( )  | 11 ( ) | 5 ( )  | 5 ( )  | 9 ( )   | 49 (0)  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 14 (0) | 8 (0)   | 22 (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.

NOTE: 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 |
| 03                    | 2019 | 56%    | 60%      | -4%                        | 58%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 55%    | 59%      | -4%                        | 57%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 49%    | 62%      | -13%                       | 58%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 58%      | -4%                        | 56%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 60%    | 59%      | 1%                         | 56%   | 4%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 49%    | 56%      | -7%                        | 55%   | -6%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 62%    | 65%      | -3%                        | 62%   | 0%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 56%    | 63%      | -7%                        | 62%   | -6%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 54%    | 67%      | -13%                       | 64%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 45%    | 63%      | -18%                       | 62%   | -17%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 51%    | 64%      | -13%                       | 60%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 42%    | 62%      | -20%                       | 61%   | -19%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 44%    | 49%      | -5%                        | 53%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 51%      | -7%                        | 55%   | -11%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 21       | 45     | 41          | 23        | 42      | 36           | 12       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 54       | 59     | 44          | 53        | 61      | 43           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 42       | 53     |             | 47        | 53      | 30           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 54       | 62     | 50          | 51        | 61      | 50           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 72       | 62     |             | 72        | 69      |              | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 52       | 59     | 47          | 52        | 63      | 49           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 23       | 43     | 57          | 20        | 34      | 41           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 49       | 61     | 76          | 43        | 53      | 57           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| ASN                                       | 75       |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 41       | 53     | 54          | 33        | 31      | 23           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 56       | 53     | 55          | 51        | 55      | 56           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 64       | 64     |             | 49        | 32      |              | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 51       | 55     | 55          | 46        | 43      | 36           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2017 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                                       | 8        | 43     | 46          | 25        | 39      | 32           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 39       | 45     | 53          | 46        | 51      | 54           | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 70       |        |             | 90        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 31       | 38     | 42          | 36        | 43      | 33           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 51     | 43          | 46        | 48      | 48           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 44       | 50     | 50          | 45        | 40      | 27           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 43     | 39          | 42        | 42      | 37           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 57   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 77   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 452  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 97%  |
| 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%       |      |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 54   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 42  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 56  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 68  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 55 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |    |

## 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 revealed that our lowest performing subgroup was the ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains. Last year's low performance may have been attributed to an increased number of risk factors among identified students. For example, we had an increase of ELL students testing for the second year. Perhaps, there could have been better monitoring checkpoints for this specific subgroup. In addition, many of these students also demonstrated a pattern of non-attendance thus impacting the number of days in school.

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

The same subgroup previously referenced in Question A is the subgroup that showed the greatest decline from the prior year, ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains. Factors that may have contributed to the decline include possibly a misalignment between the general classroom instruction and what the students were receiving through the ESE pull-out services.

#### 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 was the Science Achievement. The factors that may have contributed to the gap may have been the inconsistencies of grade-level standards progression prior to fifth grade, and the fidelity by which they were instructed. These gaps in prior years make it difficult for the fifth grade teacher to reteach prior year's standards while trying to maintain a teaching pace for the grade-level.

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

The data component that demonstrated the most improvement was Math Learning Gains, from 44% to 63%. In this area, the school invested time and resources in targeted professional development. A focus was placed on using manipulatives consistently, implementing a modified gradual release model of instruction during the 60 minute Math block, and consistent use of a personalized learning management system that creates individualized on-line instruction for students.

#### Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Areas of concern include risk factors associated with non-attendance patterns and Level 1 students and how they are progressed monitor through Tier 3 Interventions.

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

1. Reduce the number of students with <90% attendance
2. Closer monitoring processes for students identified as not meeting promotion criteria
3. Intentional professional development related to meeting the needs of our lowest 25% subgroup

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>     | ELA for the Lowest 25% Learning Gains   |
| <b>Rationale</b> | ELA for the Lowest 25% Learning Gains was selected as our area of focus because it was the only subgroup component that decreased in score from the previous year, from 57% to 44%. |

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

By the end of the 2019-2020 school year, we will increase our score for ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains from 44% to 50%, as measured by the FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Jacqueline Arnaez (jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

Teachers will participate in professional development on how to implement Balanced Literacy components through the Children's Literacy Initiative Grant.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

Balanced Literacy was selected as the evidence-based strategy because of the school's familiarity with the Children's Literacy Grant. This program embeds follow-up and intentional coaching after the professional learning sessions to help teachers transfer the new learning into classroom practice.

#### Action Step

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Description</b>        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Leadership team will meet with CLI team to determine plan for professional development.</li> <li>2. Instructional staff will attend sessions during professional learning community time.</li> <li>3. Literacy Coach and CLI team will arrange for follow-up coaching sessions.</li> <li>4. Administration will observe implementation of professional learning during classroom observations.</li> <li>5. Use the Class Data-Chat model to progress monitor implementation of new teaching strategies with the Lowest 25% sub-group.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Jacqueline Arnaez (jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com)   |

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

An improvement priority for the 2019-2020 school year will be an expansion of our work around social-emotional learning, we will continue to embed the related competencies into classroom practices and

other student experiences during day. In order to connect our families, we will share modeled behaviors that extend SEL skills learned at school into the home. The school will share related resources with our external stakeholders through the school's website and other communication forums.

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

#### **Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Each quarter, parents will have an opportunity to attend an academic related evening event. Parents will learn how to engage with their children at home in order to expand on concepts taught in school. Parents will also have the opportunity to participate in District Seminars that will reinforce learning strategies that can be used at home.

#### **PFEP Link**

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

#### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

The school works to meet all Social-Emotional needs through seamless integration of SEL competencies and academic instruction. The school also affords students many opportunities to be recognized for making good choices. For example, the school participates in the Kid of Character program, Service Learning Projects and intentional Citizenship lessons. Because the school has a strong exceptional student program, the school also participates in various peer mentoring programs.

#### **Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

For our incoming Kindergartners, parents are invited to attend an orientation in the Spring of the preceding year. The intent is to begin familiarizing the families with our school. The school also works with local pre-school programs to coordinate pre-school commencement activities on site. Once again, giving the students and the parents a chance to visit the campus and meet the staff. The outgoing cohort are taken on field trips to local middle school magnet programs in an effort to expose them to the various middle opportunities.

#### **Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

The school implements the District adopted Multi-Tiered Systems of Support in order to identify at-risk students and correlate their needs to school-based resources. Through this model, the leadership team can work to ensure essential actions and activities occur, to successfully and sustain elements of the RtI

process with fidelity. The Collaborative Problem Solving Team meets twice a month and reviews all identified students as needed.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

One of the school committees organizes a Career Day during the month of February. On this day, several community agencies and parents of students visit classrooms to share their personal college and career experiences. This event is coordinated with the annual District Take Your Child to Work Day in order to help expose students to multiple career opportunities in the community. We also participate in a teacher based college experience day where teachers share their own college choices thus exposing students to the different schools.

## Part V: Budget

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

|        |        |   |        |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA for the Lowest 25% Learning Gains | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |   | \$0.00 |