

Broward County Public Schools

# Annabel C. Perry Pk 8



2020-21 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>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</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: 7/1/2017

<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>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 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%)
<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>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</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

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	81%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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>Other</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
		<p>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.</p>
Lewis, Tiaya	Instructional Coach	<p>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.</p>

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Saturday 7/1/2017, Jeniffer O'neal

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

1

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

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

45

**Demographic Data**

<p><b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Combination School PK-8</p>

<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 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%)
<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, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	62	62	81	65	89	72	67	94	69	0	0	0	0	661
Attendance below 90 percent	15	11	20	10	32	16	16	20	9	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	

**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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Friday 9/25/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

**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

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

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

**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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%				
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						

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
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%				

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

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	92%	67%	25%	67%	25%
2018					

  

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	54%	71%	-17%	71%	-17%
2018	52%	70%	-18%	71%	-19%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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			
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				



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
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%	2
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

Due to the COVID pandemic, the most recent FSA data that can be used to determine performance is the 2018-2019 FSA. When using this lagging data, the components that showed the lowest performance include our ELA Learning Gains for lowest 25th percentile, as well as our overall Science Achievement. Within the category of the lowest 25th percentile, most of our ESSA Subgroup, the students with Disabilities, are included. Upon further data analysis, the contributing factors that support this low performance include a lack of direct targeted instruction for students who have reading deficits. For science, there was a lack of standards-based lessons that directly aligned with content standards. In response to the lack of current FSA data, an analysis of our school-wide assessments (i-Ready Diagnostic and Standards Mastery) also indicated lower performance in these areas compared to others.

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

Again, due to the COVID Pandemic, the data being analyzed is the 2018-2019 FSA. When looking at this data, the area with the greatest decline from previous years is again the ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile. As stated above, this was caused due to the lack of direct targeted instruction with specific interventions aligned to each students 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.**

Again, due to the COVID Pandemic, the data being analyzed is the 2018-2019 FSA. According to that data, the component that had the largest gap when compared to the state average was our middle schools Social Studies scores. Although our data trends have been positively increasing every year, there is still needs to be a more consistent lesson planning that directly aligns with the standards. There also needs to be more standards based teaching that uses the same rigor as the assessment requires to show mastery.

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

Again, due to the COVID Pandemic, the data being analyzed is the 2018-2019 FSA. 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 an increase in directly aligned standards-based lesson planning and assessments.

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

Based on the Early Warning Indicators the main area of concern continues to be our attendance rate. This was the case prior to the COVID pandemic and continues to be our biggest area of concern during eLearning experience. As a school, re recognize that it is impossible to make academic gains when students are not in

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

1. Increase student attendance and engagement during eLearning
2. Increase ELA Learning Gains for the lowest 25th percentile, including those with disabilities by 3 percentage points.
3. Increase overall proficiency for each reporting category by 5 percentage points.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the analysis of data, our ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities, is currently not meeting the expected proficiency of 41%. As a school, this reported group of students had an overall proficiency of 27% as measured by the 2018-2019 FSA. While we recognize the COVID pandemic may have impacted these students with the transition to virtual learning, our school expectation remains that this area will increase in overall proficiency for the 2020-2021 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:** Based on the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment, the goal of Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 will be to increase the overall percentage points for our Students with Disabilities by 3. Moving from a 27% to a 30% respectively.

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The school initiative has been focused on providing standards based lesson planning and fluent data analysis of assessments given throughout and at the completion of each instructional cycle. This is especially true for our teachers who instruct students with disabilities. The continued use of a school-wide lesson plan focusing on the gradual release model has been implemented which ensures that the use of various intervention programs are being used within the classroom to provide a deeper focus on appropriate accommodations and modifications for all of our students with varying exceptionalities. In addition, targeted PD's and deconstructing the standards according to the school-wide IFC, data driven PLC's, and assessments are in place for the entire year. Modifications to the interventions and TIERed teaching are ongoing based on fluid data analysis.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards-based instruction with a focus on appropriate research based interventions was something the school was lacking. Thus, our school has narrowed down our focus to ensuring the teachers first understand the standards (the what) and in what ways they are going to teach it (the why) and then how they will break it down further into appropriate teaching chunks for those who need the intervention. Research based materials such as Wilson Reading and LLI are being implemented during specific blocks throughout the day by the classroom teachers. Support facilitators are using both a push-in and pull-out model of support to assist in the instructional delivery for those SWD's as well as to ensure all of the interventions match each students IEP goals. In addition, paraprofessionals have been specifically assigned to assist with all areas of instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Data Analysis of all current student mastery.
2. Review of IFC, Standards-Content Limits, and Item Specifications PRIOR to planning a lesson.
3. Review SWD IEP's with support facilitator and ESE Specialist to determine appropriate intervention.
4. Analyze current standard cluster assessment prior to beginning instructional cycle.
5. Plan standards based lessons with the assessment as the guide
6. Instruct using gradual release model and project based learning
7. Support facilitation assistance on targeted student levels
8. Administer Assessment
9. Analyze Data
10. Monitor IEP Goals and Response to various interventions
11. Provide reteach, enrichment based on data analysis.

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile dropped 14 points overall. As stated previously, this can be attributed to a lack of targeted interventions to assist with closing the gap for students with reading deficits. Overall, this area was identified due to having out students not making 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.

**Measurable Outcome:** At the end of the 2020-2021 school year, Annabel C. Perry PreK-8's ELA Learning Gains for the lowest 25th percentile will increase by 10 percentage points to 51%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Thomas Correll (thomas.correll@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Due to the COVID pandemic, the focus of the schools initiative has not changed from the previous year. It remains focused on lesson based planning and fluent data analysis of each assessment given. The development of a school-wide lesson plan focusing on the gradual release model has continued to be implemented. Targeted PLC'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 intervention. A school wide intervention block as been built into the master schedule to assist students since the eLearning onset.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Due to the COVID pandemic, the rational for this strategy is mainly the same. However, the gaps that have been accrued based on the eLearning transition have also been accounted for. Thus, based on the current learning situation and past data trends, standards based instruction is still not being implemented at the appropriate level of rigor the standard and the assessment limits call for. Therefor, we are continuing our process of narrowing the focus to ensure teachers fully comprehend their standards (the what) and how they are going to teach it (the how). Teachers are still planning with the end in mind. They are using standards based assessments from iReady, Curriculum Associates as well as District adopted materials are being use to plan all instruction to ensure the teachers understand what mastery of the standard looks like. In addition, data analysis will take place after each assessment to ensure mastery.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Data Analysis of current standards mastery
2. Review IFC, Standard Content Limits, and Item Specifications prior to lesson planning
3. Analyze assessment of current cluster
4. Plan standards based lesson based on assessment
5. Instruct using standards based materials focusing on the gradual release model
6. Give assessment after instruction.
7. Review and analyze assessment
8. Review, reteach, or enrich based on data analysis
9. Based on analysis, targeted students will receive intervention to assist in mastering standard.

**Person Responsible** Genevieve Leydig (genevieve.leydig@browardschools.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The same action plan described above the being used to ensure all reporting areas improve at least 3 percentage points.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

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

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

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

Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 prides itself on ensuring our schools commitment to our mission and vision by maintaining our "Culture of Caring". We involve all stakeholders in an ongoing, organized, and timely manner in the planning of the various school initiatives and welcome all feedback to continue to improve. For example, stakeholders are active in the development of the School-Level Parent and Family Engagement Plan as well as the School Improvement Plan and School-Wide Positive Behavior Plan. Stakeholders are given opportunities to ask questions in order to ensure their full understanding of each of the plans. In addition, all stakeholders are involved in active communication through parent links, email, social media, our website, CANVAS announcements and the school marquee. In addition, due to COVID, multiple parent nights will be held virtually to continue building a positive school community connection. Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 continues to work closely and further develop partnerships with the City Commissioners, Miramar PD, Faith Based Community Leaders, and Community Headstart programs within our zone.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1631 - Annabel C. Perry Pk 8			\$3,000.00

						<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>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$30,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1631 - Annabel C. Perry Pk 8			\$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>Total:</b>						<b>\$33,000.00</b>