

Broward County Public Schools

Stirling Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

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

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

Table of Contents

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

Stirling Elementary School

5500 STIRLING RD, Hollywood, FL 33021

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">79%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">77%</p>

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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	

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	

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	

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	

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	
Title	ELA for the Lowest 25% Learning Gains
Rationale	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	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership team will meet with CLI team to determine plan for professional development. 2. Instructional staff will attend sessions during professional learning community time. 3. Literacy Coach and CLI team will arrange for follow-up coaching sessions. 4. Administration will observe implementation of professional learning during classroom observations. 5. Use the Class Data-Chat model to progress monitor implementation of new teaching strategies with the Lowest 25% sub-group.
Person Responsible	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 may 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 Rtl

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