

Broward County Public Schools

# Annabel C. Perry Pk 8



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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

## Annabel C. Perry Pk 8

6850 SW 34TH ST, M IR Amar, FL 33023

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Jeniffer O'neal**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (43%) 2014-15: D (38%)
<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>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Annabel C. Perry Pk 8

6850 SW 34TH ST, M IR Amar, FL 33023

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Combination School PK-8</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">90%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">98%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	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.**

The mission of Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 is to create “A Culture of Caring” in a safe and nurturing environment by being open-minded about other cultures, showing compassion toward others, and reflecting on individual behaviors to promote internationally-minded people.

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

The vision of Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 is to develop internationally minded students, through inquiry-based learning and a curriculum that fosters cultural awareness.

### 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
Leydig, Genevieve	Assistant Principal	<p>The main role of the Assistant Principal is to assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community. The Assistant Principal is an instructional leader responsible for all curriculum and instructional strategies by ensuring that all educators in the building are displaying an understanding of current educational trends, research and technology. The Assistant Principal is also responsible for the communication of school information, goals, student learning and behavior expectations to all customer groups using effective communication techniques with students, teachers, parents and all community stakeholders.</p>
Olagbemi, Juliet	School Counselor	<p>The role as the School Counselor is to implement a proactive guidance program that cultivates academic achievement, personal/social growth, and career exploration. The Guidance Counselor collaborates with all stakeholders to provide appropriate resources to benefit the student body. They also deliver and arrange essential training for staff to promote a healthy school environment.</p>
Laborde, Sandra	Instructional Coach	<p>The Literacy Coach's role is to support teachers in their daily work. They model and discuss lessons, co-teach lessons, visit classrooms, and provide feedback to teachers. They are a resource to parents and the community and are uniquely positioned to see the big picture -- the way in which people are working, the impact they're having, the needs of students, teachers and administrators. The Literacy Coach can help others see the big picture and work towards systemic changes. They support the process of gathering data, information and resources so that changes can be effective. They also use an inquiry process approach to ask questions and explore root causes.</p>
McCord, Nicole	Instructional Coach	<p>The Instructional Coach, serves as an instructional leader by providing teachers with individualized support in order to improve their practice and their ability to analyze student work and data. The Instructional Coach provides teachers with targeted, research-based instructional practices and intervention strategies for all literacy learners, in order to improve student achievement. This occurs through observations, literacy-focused modeling, consultation, and planning. The role of a Instructional Coach also consists of engaging stakeholders that include, but are not limited to, students, school staff, district staff, families, and members of the community through means such as direct communication, meetings, and outreach activities. The role of a Instructional Coach, consists of being a part of the decision making process, by serving on the school's leadership team. As a member of the team, the Instructional Coach facilitates professional literacy learning school-wide, collaborates with administration in areas such as literacy instruction to sustain and increase student achievement.</p>
Foster, Jacqueline	Other	<p>The Primary Years Program (PYP) Magnet Coordinator at Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 is a teacher recruit from the teaching staff. The PYP coordinator has 18 years of teaching experience in the classroom and is the team leader for</p>



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>different grade levels. During these years, the PYP coordinator coached new teachers and the last two years served in a leadership role and PYP coordinator. As required by the International Baccalaureate Organization, the PYP coordinator reports directly to the principal and assistant principals who share the responsibilities of the PYP coordinator. At Annabel C. Perry PreK-8, there is a commitment to collaborative planning of the PYP written curriculum. The PYP coordinator ensures that the pedagogical aspects are discussed, information is disseminated, and the program is planned, taught and assessed collaboratively. The leadership team at Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 and the PYP coordinator is involved in the whole-school implementation and organization of the IB program. Other duties include being the liaison between the school and the district magnet coordinators, the school's teaching team, and communicating IB information to parents. Professional Development for IB authorized training is done by the PYP magnet coordinator.</p>
<p>Oneal, Jennifer</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>The main role of the Assistant Principal is to assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community. The Assistant Principal is an instructional leader responsible for all curriculum and instructional strategies by ensuring that all educators in the building are displaying an understanding of current educational trends, research and technology. The Assistant Principal is also responsible for the communication of school information, goals, student learning and behavior expectations to all customer groups using effective communication techniques with students, teachers, parents and all community stakeholders.</p>
<p>Correll, Thomas</p>	<p>Principal</p>	<p>The role of the School Principal is to provide instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school in order to maintain a safe and nurturing learning environment. The School Principal also prepares and manages the school's budget including keeping an accurate inventory of the school's assets. The Principal must also read, interpret, follow and enforce the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and other state and federal laws. The Principal must use effective interview techniques, coaching procedures, and evaluation procedures to ensure instruction takes place at the highest level of rigor to prepare students in a 21st century learning environment. The Principal must enforce collective bargaining agreements, use effective public speaking skills, group dynamics, and interaction and problem-solving skills. In doing this, he/she must maintain a sensitivity to multicultural issues, perceive the impact of a decision on other components of the organization and then communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, and through the use of technology. Finally, the School Principal must be able to and analyze and use data to make necessary changes to instruction to promote teaching and learning throughout the year.</p>
<p>Stanway, Shelby</p>	<p>Teacher, ESE</p>	<p>The role of the ESE Specialist is to serve as the principal's designee for all exceptional student education (ESE) staff in accordance with the annual</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Local Education Agency (LEA) Memo. In addition, the ESE Specialist will coordinate required ESE meetings, provide information to school-based personnel on a variety of topics to include updating staff on policy changes, and assist regular education teachers of students with disabilities to implement the Individual Education Plan (IEP) and monitor progress of IEP goals. In addition, the ESE Specialist will meet with ESE curriculum supervisors monthly with regard to curricula, related services and program delivery systems for students with disabilities and provide explanations to parent(s) of the Procedural Safeguards as well as the availability of resources within the District to meet the unique needs of the student.
Lewis, Tiaya	Instructional Coach	The Mathematics Coach's responsibility is to provide personalized support that is based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that fosters the growth and development of teachers. In addition to strategic content- focused mentoring, the coach will support teachers to develop skills in critical areas such as establishing a positive classroom culture and climate, implementing instructional strategies, analyzing student work, differentiating instruction and supporting English Language learners and student with special needs. In addition, the coach will plan to work collaboratively, build skills, analyze data, examine needs related to professional practice and engage in peer coaching with teachers.

**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	53	77	52	83	75	63	94	71	68	0	0	0	0	636
Attendance below 90 percent	5	13	7	6	3	5	3	1	6	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	8	9	9	17	19	16	0	0	0	0	78

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

45

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

Saturday 8/24/2019

**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	19	17	15	19	10	11	7	3	5	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	7	3	5	1	25	12	20	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	13	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	33	54	53	34	39	0	0	0	0	252

**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	6	4	25	26	40	21	12	22	0	0	0	0	157

**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	45%	58%	61%	40%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	58%	59%	50%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	54%	42%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	47%	58%	62%	43%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%	58%	59%	47%	53%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	51%	52%	38%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	33%	51%	56%	43%	46%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	74%	78%	59%	71%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	53 (0)	77 (0)	52 (0)	83 (0)	75 (0)	63 (0)	94 (0)	71 (0)	68 (0)	636 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ( )	13 ( )	7 ( )	6 ( )	3 ( )	5 ( )	3 ( )	1 ( )	6 ( )	49 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	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 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	9 (0)	9 (0)	17 (0)	19 (0)	16 (0)	78 (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	46%	60%	-14%	58%	-12%
	2018	41%	59%	-18%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	62%	-11%	58%	-7%
	2018	44%	58%	-14%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	38%	59%	-21%	56%	-18%
	2018	34%	56%	-22%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019	35%	57%	-22%	54%	-19%
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	52%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	46%	55%	-9%	52%	-6%
	2018	33%	54%	-21%	51%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	45%	59%	-14%	56%	-11%
	2018	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	65%	-22%	62%	-19%
	2018	47%	63%	-16%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	67%	-11%	64%	-8%
	2018	37%	63%	-26%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	33%	64%	-31%	60%	-27%
	2018	29%	62%	-33%	61%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	35%	58%	-23%	55%	-20%
	2018	40%	55%	-15%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	54%	53%	1%	54%	0%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	54%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	40%	45%	-5%	46%	-6%
	2018	44%	47%	-3%	45%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	23%	49%	-26%	53%	-30%
	2018	29%	51%	-22%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	27%	43%	-16%	48%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	45%	-5%	50%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	67%	25%	67%	25%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	71%	-17%	71%	-17%
2018	52%	70%	-18%	71%	-19%
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	100%	61%	39%	61%	39%
2018	100%	63%	37%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	38	30	17	47	49	7	10			
ELL	41	56	53	41	57	52	26	10			

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
BLK	42	50	40	46	59	54	34	54	96		
HSP	61	64	50	53	66	50	22	60			
FRL	43	49	41	46	60	56	30	56	95		
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	13	33	33	9	29	33	6				
ELL	16	62	78	29	38	36	8				
BLK	41	51	51	39	44	33	31	53	43		
HSP	38	73	80	52	64	60	53				
FRL	41	54	56	41	46	34	34	48	43		
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	12	31	33	17	26	23	7				
ELL	15	39	40	22	36	40		70			
BLK	41	50	40	41	45	38	41	58	54		
HSP	35	44	54	51	52		48	50			
FRL	41	50	40	42	45	33	43	58	45		

**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	55
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	54
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	53
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	



Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
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.

Based on our data analysis, the components that showed the lowest performance include our ELA Learning Gains for our lowest 25th percentile, as well as our overall Science Achievement. Based on this analysis the contributing factors for our lowest 25th percentile in reading include a lack of direct targeted instruction for those students who have reading deficits. For science, there was a lack of standards-based lessons that directly aligned with current content standards.

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

When it comes to the greatest decline from previous years, it was again our ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile. As stated above, this is caused by a lack of targeted interventions to assist with closing the gap for students with reading deficits.

#### 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.

According to the data, the component that had the largest gap when compared to the state average was our Social Studies component. While our Social Studies scores have been increasing every year, there still needs to be a more consistent lesson planning that directly aligns with the standards. There also needs to be more standards-based teaching with the same rigor that the assessment requires.

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

The component that showed the greatest improvement was our Math Learning Gains for our lowest 25th percentile. This was directly due to the school increasing the number of math interventions that aligned with each of the student needs and also a direct alignment with standards-based lesson planning and assessments.

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

Based on the Early Warning Indicators the main area of concern is our attendance rate. This is especially true in our primary grades. We understand that it is nearly impossible to make improvements when students are not in attendance.

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

1. Increase student attendance
2. Increase ELA Learning Gains for the lowest 25th percentile
3. Increase overall proficiency for each reporting category by 5 percentage points.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	The ELA Learning Gains for Lowest 25th Percentile will increase by 14 percentage points.
<b>Rationale</b>	Our ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile dropped 14 points overall. As stated above, this is caused by a lack of targeted interventions to assist with closing the gap for students with reading deficits. These students include our students with disabilities which is our area of concern. Overall, this area was identified due to having our students not make the necessary gains to show yearly growth. As a school, our primary focus is on ensuring that all students have the opportunity to show adequate growth by the end of the year.

<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	At the end of the 2019-2020 school year, Annabel C. Perry PreK-8's ELA Learning Gains for the lowest 25th Percentile will increase by 14 points to 55%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Thomas Correll (thomas.correll@browardschools.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>This year, the school's initiative has been focused on standards based lesson planning and fluent data analysis of each assessment given. The development of a school-wide lesson plan focusing on the gradual release model has been implemented. Targeted PD's on deconstructing the standards according to the school-wide IFC and data driven PLC's, based on assessments, are in place for the entire year. Quarterly data chats with administration and teachers as well as interim data chats with students are taking place. A valid and specific Rtl process is in place for those students identified as needing assistance. Direct and specific interventions are being used with fidelity to monitor students' response to the intervention. .</p> <p>Based on research and past data trends from this location, standards based instruction was not being completed at the level of rigor the standard and assessment limits called for. Therefore, using the research from Driven by Data, the school has narrowed down its focus to ensure teachers fully comprehend their standards (the what) and in what ways they are going to teach it (the how). Teachers are able to complete this by having the end in mind. Standards based assessments from iReady, Curriculum Associates, as well as District adopted materials are being used to plan all instruction to ensure teachers have an understanding of how the standard is to be mastered. In addition, detailed data analysis of each assessment given has been proven to be effective in assisting students in understanding why they mastered or didn't master a given skill.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	

**Action Step**

<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data Analysis of current student mastery</li> <li>2. Review IFC, Standard Content Limits, and Item Specifications prior to lesson planning</li> <li>3. Analyze assessment of current cluster</li> <li>4. Plan standards based lesson based on assessment</li> <li>5. Instruct using standards based materials focusing on the gradual release model</li> <li>6. Give assessment after instruction</li> <li>7. Review and analyze assessment</li> <li>8. Review, reteach, or enrich based on data analysis.</li> <li>9. Based on analysis, targeted students will be attending ELO camps for review, reteach and enrichment.</li> </ol>
--------------------	--

**Person Responsible** Sandra Laborde (sandra.laborde@browardschools.com)

---

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Students with disabilities will increase in proficiency by 5% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
<b>Rationale</b>	Based on this analysis the our students with disabilities are currently not meeting state requirements for proficiency of 41%. As a school, we are sitting with 27% of our students with disabilities meeting proficiency goals .As a school, the expectation is for this percentage to increase.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** Based on the 2019-2020 Florida Standards Assessment, the goal of Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 is to increase by 5 percentage points. Moving from a 27% to a 32% respectively.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Genevieve Leydig (genevieve.leydig@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy** The schools initiative has been focused on standards based lesson planning and fluent data analysis of each assessment given and this is especially true for our teachers who instruct students with disabilities. The development of a school-wide lesson plan focusing on the gradual release model has been implemented with a specific focus on appropriate accommodations and modifications needed to assist those students who have varying exceptionalities. In addition, targeted PD's on deconstructing the standards according to the school-wide IFC, data driven PLC's, and assessments, are in place for the entire year. During PLC's, the ESE Specialist and Support Facilitators plan and meet with grade level teams to assist in the appropriate accommodations and modifications for lesson planning for our students with disabilities. Direct and specific interventions are being used with fidelity to monitor students' response to the interventions as well as their growth toward their individual education plans.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** Standards-based instruction was not being completed at the level of rigor the standards called for. Using research from Driven by Data, the school has narrowed down its focus to ensure teachers comprehend their standards (the what) and in what ways they are going to teach it (the how). Standards based assessments from various locations are being used to plan all instruction. Research-based materials such as Wilson Reading and LLI are being implemented for SWDs. Data analysis of each assessment is taking place. The school moved to a push-in and pull-out method for our support facilitators and we have devised specific groups that will receive interventions that specifically match their IEP goals. We have a support model in our K,1,3, and 5th grade. Students with disabilities have additional support from a paraprofessional to assist with all areas of instruction.

**Action Step**

- Description**
1. Data Analysis of current student mastery
  2. Review IFC, Standard Content Limits, and Item Specifications prior to lesson planning
  3. Support Facilitation assistance on targeted student levels
  4. Analyze assessment of current cluster
  5. Plan standards-based lesson based on assessment
  6. Instruct using standards-based materials focusing on the gradual release model
  7. Support Facilitation assistance on targeted student levels-Instruction Piece
  8. Give assessment after instruction
  9. Review and analyze assessment

10. Monitor IEP and response to instruction.

11. Based on analysis, targeted students will be attending ELO camps for review, reteach and enrichment.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Stanway (shelby.stanway@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).**

The same action plan described above is being used to ensure all reporting areas improve. Our goal as a school is to increase overall proficiency in all categories by at least 5%.

## 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.**

Annabel C. Perry PreK -8 will involve parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner in the planning and improvement of the School-Level Parent and Family Engagement Plan(PFEP) and the School Improvement Plan(SIP). Parents will be given opportunities to ask questions to help them in their understanding of the SIP and the PFEP. In addition to parent-teacher communication, parents will be notified of programs and family engagement through email, parent links, social media, and school marquee. Reading, Math, Science, and Writing Nights provide standard based activities which are designed to build capacity of parents to help their children at home. Annabel C. Perry Pre-K – 8 will continue to work closely with the City Commission to developed a partnership with Liaison Group, Faith Based Community Leaders, and Community Headstart Programs within the zone. This connection will provide an increased number of outreach programs and volunteers who can assist with resources for the development of the school.

#### 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.**

Students identified as neglected and/or delinquent will be connected to the school social worker and guidance counselor who provide support and community resources. Teachers and staff members are responsible for helping to identify homeless students and referring them to the Homeless Education Program offered by the district. The purpose of the Homeless Education Program is to identify homeless students, remove barriers to their education, including school enrollment, provide them with supplemental academic and counseling case management services as well as linkages to their school social worker while maintaining school as the students' stale environment. In addition, all teachers are trained in Social Emotional Learning strategies that are infused into daily lesson such as Start with Hello and See Something, Say Something.

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

As a PreK-8 school our main focus is conducting vertical articulation meetings during the school year to ensure a smooth transition from grade level to grade level. Orientations are held in Kindergarten and 5th grade to ensure an easy orientation to the next grade level. This gives the incoming students an opportunity to meet their new teacher a get acclimated to their classrooms. Additionally parents are given an overview of the curriculum and expectations for each grade level during curriculum nights and different events.

**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.**

Annabel C. Perry utilizes the prior year assessment data from the FSA, BAS reading scores, internal assessments, and the iReady diagnostic to guide instruction and make decisions to meet the needs of all students. Based on the data, administrators and support staff generate decisions on resources that are needed. These meetings are held weekly. FSA Assessments/ Conferences are conducted to discuss child’s assessment results, expectations, and goals for the school year. This will be conducted bi-Annually. The school provides a Curriculum Nights for parents and students. This allows for parents and students to have a better understanding of the standards. Furthermore, parents are provided with specific instructional strategies and resources that they can use at home. The Curriculum Coaches, teachers, and administrative staff are involved in the planning and execution of curriculum nights.

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

The Guidance Counselor provides lessons focusing on career and technical education. In addition all 5th and 8th grade students will receive instruction through the Achievement Biztown program and attend a year work related experience at JA Biztown. Through the SMART initiative students work through rigorous curriculum and use technology to build skills and research and experience different career fields, colleges and universities.

**Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: The ELA Learning Gains for Lowest 25th Percentile will increase by 14 percentage points.</b>				<b>\$30,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1631 - Annabel C. Perry Pk 8	Title, I Part A		\$30,000.00
			<i>Notes: iReady Curriculum and Curriculum Associates (LAFS) Books were bought to assist in improving overall ELA Learning Gains for the lowest 25%.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Students with disabilities will increase in proficiency by 5% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.</b>				<b>\$4,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

			1631 - Annabel C. Perry Pk 8	School Improvement Funds		\$4,500.00	
			<i>Notes: Accountability funds will be proposed to be used to assist in after school tutoring for students with disabilities. The amount will be voted on by SAC.</i>				
						<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$34,500.00</b>