Annabel C. Perry Pk 8

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%)
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	
* 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.](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

Annabel C. Perry Pk 8

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

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Correll, Thomas	Principal	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.
Leydig, Genevieve	Assistant Principal	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.
Oneal, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	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.
Foster, Jacqueline	Magnet Coordinator	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 different grade levels. During these years, the PYP coordinator coached new

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.
Laborde, Sandra	Reading Coach	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.
McCord, Nicole	Reading Coach	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.
Lewis, Tiaya	Math 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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stanway, Shelby	Teacher, ESE	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 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.
Chandler , Kristin	Science Coach	The Science 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 to better understand science concepts and related materials.

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.*
5

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Total number of students enrolled at the school
655

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	77	71	90	81	92	76	75	59	72	0	0	0	0	693
Attendance below 90 percent	34	23	34	16	36	24	16	17	11	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	34	18	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	41	24	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	15	17	33	24	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	17	12	42	25	0	0	0	0	106
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	7	26	29	25	12	43	59	27	0	0	0	0	229

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	3	17	20	21	21	35	60	34	0	0	0	0	212

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	1	3	16	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				45%	58%	61%	41%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	58%	59%	54%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	52%	54%	55%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				47%	58%	62%	41%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				60%	58%	59%	47%	56%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	51%	52%	36%	49%	52%
Science Achievement				33%	51%	56%	34%	52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				54%	74%	78%	52%	75%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	59%	-21%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019	35%	57%	-22%	54%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	46%	55%	-9%	52%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	45%	59%	-14%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	65%	-22%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	67%	-11%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	64%	-31%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
06	2021					
	2019	35%	58%	-23%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
07	2021					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	40%	45%	-5%	46%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	23%	49%	-26%	53%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	27%	43%	-16%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	92%	67%	25%	67%	25%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	54%	71%	-17%	71%	-17%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	100%	61%	39%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Each grade level uses both formative and summative assessments throughout each instructional cycle. These assessments are both common formatives (per grade level) and common summative (per grade level). Data analysis/chats take place with administration at the end of each instructional cycle to plan for intervention and/or enrichment. Data analysis includes a deep dive into standards as well as the assessment used to measure mastery. Each assessment is analysis to ensure the rigor of the questions match the DOK level of each standard being taught. Some of the assessments include but are not limited to; iReady diagnostic, iReady standards mastery, LAFS interim assessment based on standards cluster, Go Math standards assessment, as well as Benchmark B.E.S.T. standards assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	33	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	31	48
	Students With Disabilities	38	30	38
	English Language Learners	33	22	20
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	27	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	27	53
	Students With Disabilities	33	30	66
	English Language Learners	14	11	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	30	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	33	30
	Students With Disabilities	20	35	33
	English Language Learners	12	25	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	21	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	18	25
	Students With Disabilities	30	25	20
	English Language Learners	12	28	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	44	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	40	53
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	12
	English Language Learners	10	20	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	24	16
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	19	18
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	42	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	40	38
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	9	28	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	26	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	28	18
	Students With Disabilities	0	18	0
	English Language Learners	0	18	8

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	23	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	22	22
	Students With Disabilities	5	5	12
	English Language Learners	33	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	21	15
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	19	10
	Students With Disabilities	10	15	6
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			9
	Economically Disadvantaged			5
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	32	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	31	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	22	33	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	26	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	26	32
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	11	0

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	40	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	36	34
	Students With Disabilities	8	18	9
	English Language Learners	25	50	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	23	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	23	29
	Students With Disabilities	4	9	19
	English Language Learners	3	25	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			34
	Economically Disadvantaged			29
	Students With Disabilities			19
	English Language Learners			75

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	46	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	44	33
	Students With Disabilities	13	27	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	27	10
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	27	13
	Students With Disabilities	6	7	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			6
	Economically Disadvantaged			5
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	7	21	24	10	16	10	3	19			
ELL	31	33		16	22		19				
BLK	33	37	36	21	21	20	12	35	50		
HSP	43	32		30	29		25				
FRL	33	35	44	22	20	18	10	32	45		
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		

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	32
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on the 2020-2021 FSA assessment data, numerous trends emerged. All content areas and subgroups declined in both overall proficiency as well as learning gains. However, it is important to note that Broward County Public Schools offered both virtual education as well as in-person for the entire 2020-2021 school year. At Annabel C. Perry PreK-8, over 60% of our students and numerous staff members remained on the virtual platform thus hindering their educational success by not being instructed in a traditional setting.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Although all instructional areas and subgroups dropped significantly in 2020-2021, the highest need of improvement is our overall Math proficiency as well as our learning gains for our entire population including the lowest 25 percent. This significant drop is also found throughout the state of Florida as well as within the Broward County School District as a whole.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The COVID pandemic proved to be the biggest factor that contributed to the decline in all areas. This was due to lack of standards based teaching within a traditional setting. Effective Mathematical instruction depends on the use of various instructional methods of delivery. This includes hands-on methods through the use of various manipulatives. Throughout the COVID pandemic, this particular method of instruction proved to be difficult in a virtual format. In addition, mathematic concepts build on one-another as students progress through grade levels. In the 2019-2020 school year, due to the stay at home order and closure of schools, students did not have the opportunity to finish the year with proper instruction. Finally, progress monitoring tools may have been compromised as nearly all students took assessments at home and not within test-like settings which may have produced inaccurate data.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Unfortunately, due to the COVID pandemic and uncontrollable events that directly related to this pandemic, no measurable FSA areas showed improvement. However, areas not measured by the FSA such as utilizing virtual education platforms as well as increasing the social emotional wellbeing of students and staff increased immensely.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

As a school, we knew we needed to focus on the whole child during these unprecedented times. We increased access to virtual platforms to assist in teaching and learning for all stakeholders as well as implemented SEL curriculum into our daily routines.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The significate loss in valid and purposeful standards based instruction is our first priority as we enter this school year. Therefore various research based strategies must be implemented in order to close the achievement gap created over these past 17 months. Classroom teachers, Literacy Coaches, Science Coach, Math Coach, ESSER Pull-Out Teachers, Assistant Principals, and the Guidance

Counselor will ensure that the needs of all students ranging from PreK-8 are being met on a consistent basis. This will be done through targeted PD's and PLC's on unwrapping the benchmarks, using assessments to drive rigorous instruction, and planning with the end in mind. All teachers create Common Formative and Summative Assessments to ensure rigorous content is assessed. Teachers continuously analyze test data related to student performance in all content to enforce data driven instruction. They promote technology education using researched based programs such as, I-Ready and Reflex Math to provide our students with a plethora of learning opportunities and resources. in addition, targeted interventions will be provided to the lowest quartile using research based (LLI) intervention programs.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Targeted PD's and PLC's on unwrapping the benchmarks, using assessments to drive rigorous instruction, and planning with the end in mind (Book study, Driven by Data) will be conducted biweekly throughout the school year. For the PD's, teachers will be provided hands on trainings that allow for them to reflect and infuse the new knowledge directly into their lessons immediately. For PLC's, teachers will use this time to plan with their grade level/subject area teachers with coaches assistance in order to put their learning into action.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services include the use of ESSER teachers to target "bubble" students in grades 3-8 in order to provide the necessary remediation/enrichment for each standard taught. In addition, intervention teachers targeting out lowest 25% and SWD will be pulling tiered groups daily. They will be providing intervention using research based programs such as LLI (leveled literacy intervention) and Phonics for Reading.

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 0% as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA. While we recognize the COVID pandemic may have impacted these students with the transition to virtual learning, our school expectation remines that this area will increase in overall prolificacy for the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the 2021-2022 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 0% to a 30% respectively.
Monitoring:	Instructional cycles at Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 always conclude with in-depth data analysis through data chants and assessment reviews. During these times, the entire support staff team as well as the teachers dive into student mastery, student areas of need as well as validity of assessment and interventions provided. At the conclusion of these meetings, a new plan of action is created and implemented immediately to ensure mastery towards our goal is met. In addition, our SWD's are progress monitored thorough IEP meetings, content of Present Level Performance sheets, as well as intervention program assessments.
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 use within the classroom and outside of 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 gudie

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 Genevieve Leydig (genevieve.leydig@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Like all measurable areas on the 2020-2021 FSA, our ELA overall proficiency percentile in grades 3, 4, and 5 dropped and is now at 32%, 35%, and 25% respectively. As stated previously, this can be attributed to a lack of targeted interventions to assist with closing the gap for students with reading deficits due to the COVID Pandemic. Overall, this area was identified due to having our 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 2021-2022 school year, Annabel C. Perry PreK-8's ELA proficiency in grades 3,4,and 5 will increase percentage points to 50% or higher as measured by the 2021-2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Instructional cycles at Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 always conclude with in-depth data analysis through data chats and assessment reviews. During these times, the entire support staff team as well as the teachers dive into student mastery, student areas of need as well as validity of assessment and interventions provided. At the conclusion of these meetings, a new plan of action is created and implemented immediately to ensure mastery towards our goal is met.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sandra Laborde (sandra.laborde@browardschools.com)
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, LLI, Horizons, and other District adopted materials 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. In addition, all teachers have a built in intervention period in their daily schedule to better support the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to the COVID pandemic, the rational for this strategy is mainly the same as previous years. 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. Therefore, we are continuing our process of narrowing the focus to ensure teachers fully comprehend their standards and how they will be assessed. 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 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   Sandra Laborde (sandra.laborde@browardschools.com)

#3. Other specifically relating to Math Learning Gains	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Like all measurable areas on the 2020-2021 FSA, our Mathematics learning gains percentile dropped and is now at 22%. As stated previously, this can be attributed to a lack of standards based instruction and targeted interventions to assist with closing the gap for students that were lacking previous grade level mathematical concepts due to the COVID Pandemic. Overall, this area was identified due to having our 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 2021-2022 school year, Annabel C. Perry PreK-8's Mathematics Learning Gains will increase to 70% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	Instructional cycles at Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 always conclude with in-depth data analysis through data chants and assessment reviews. During these times, the entire support staff team as well as the teachers dive into student mastery, student areas of need as well as validity of assessment and interventions provided. At the conclusion of these meetings, a new plan of action is created and implemented immediately to ensure mastery towards our goal is met.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiaya Lewis (tiaya.lewis@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Like our ELA initiative, the math strategy being using is the same. Standards-based instruction with a focus on appropriate research based interventions is being used. 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. This includes focusing on the content limits of the standard, knowing what is going to be assessed and to what rigor and selecting the appropriate manipulatives to assist all learns in mastering the concept. Research based materials such as iReady Tool Box, Go Math Intervention, and other District adopted materials 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. In addition, all teachers have a built in intervention period in their daily schedule to better support the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to the COVID pandemic, the rational for this strategy is mainly the same as previous years. However, the gaps that have been accrued based on the eLearning transition have also been accounted for. Based on the current learning situation and past data trends, standards based instruction was not implemented at the appropriate level of rigor for the standard and for what the assessment limits call for. In addition, previous grade level math concepts were missing due to the COVID pandemic. Therefore, we are continuing our process of narrowing the focus to ensure teachers fully comprehend their standards and how they will be assessed. Teachers are still planning with the end in mind and understand the content limits of each standrad. They are using standards based assessments from i-Ready, Curriculum Associates as well as District adopted materials 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   Tiaya Lewis (tiaya.lewis@browardschools.com)

#4. Other specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Like all measurable areas on the 2020-2021 FSA, our overall science proficiency percentile dropped and is now at 15%. As stated previously, this can be attributed to a lack of targeted interventions to assist with closing the gap for students with reading deficits as well as science content knowledge due to the COVID Pandemic. Overall, this area was identified due to having our students not understating the necessary concepts to show mastery on the FSA. As a school, our primary focus is on ensuring that all students have the opportunity to show adequate mastery on the science assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the 2021-2022 school year, Annabel C. Perry PreK-8's overall science proficiency percentile will increase to 50% as measured by the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Instructional cycles at Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 always conclude with in-depth data analysis through data chants and assessment reviews. During these times, the entire support staff team as well as the teachers dive into student mastery, student areas of need as well as validity of assessment and interventions provided. At the conclusion of these meetings, a new plan of action is created and implemented immediately to ensure mastery towards our goal is met.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Chandler (kristin.chandler@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will provide opportunities for students to learn how to read and understand science-based literature and informational text using researched based materials. This cross-curricular connection will assist in the understanding of science content through the ELA lens. In addition, science based experiments with vertical alignment to previously taught content will be used. Students will receive hands-on approaches to learning to ensure mastery of content is obtained.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Infusing science into other content areas increases the ability to drive home concepts of best reading practices. Due to the nature of the assessment, students must be able to read and comprehend technique and informational text in order to draw conclusions about scientific content. Thus, this approach to teaching will assist students by exposing them to the way in which the standards will be assessed. In addition, using hands on experiments assists conceptual understanding by allowing students to "see science in action."

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- using both experiments as well as informational texts.
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	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Overall, our school reported 1.1 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide combination school rate of 1.6 incidents per 100 students. We have zero property incidents and zero drug related incidents. However, our two areas of concern are fighting and physical attack. In order to reduce these areas, we have implemented a school wide positive behavior plan that focuses on social emotional learning as well as positive rewards. Our mission is to maintain our "Culture of Caring", so that all stakeholders feel safe and welcomed within our building. Thus, this year, our teachers will have a focus on the whole child, implementing various Social and Emotional learning strategies to promote a healthy mindset and thus decrease other behaviors such as bullying self- harm, fighting, and physical attacks. The first ten minutes of everyday are dedicated to mindfulness and throughout the day students are praised and rewarded for positive behavior through our Penguin Bucks rewards system. The success of these interventions will be measured by quarterly PBIS meetings in which discipline data will be reviewed and changes will be made if needed.

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.

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. Various SEL and Mindfulness activities take place throughout the school day to better promote a positive mindset and set a positive culture. In addition, 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 to encourage a family approach of community involvement to better the school culture.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All stakeholders (teachers, non-instructional employees, students, parents, and community members) are all responsible for promoting a positive culture here at Annabel C. Perry PreK-8. All stakeholders are responsible for being open-minded about other cultures, showing compassion toward others, and reflecting on individual behaviors to promote internationally-minded people which promotes our "Culture of Caring".

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				$11,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1631 - Annabel C. Perry Pk 8	Other		$11,000.00
			Notes: Title 1 funds will be used used to assist in after school tutoring for students with disabilities.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$161,648.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1631 - Annabel C. Perry Pk 8	Other		$161,648.00
			Notes: Title 1 funds will be proposed to be used to assist in after school tutoring for students as well as for curriculum and resource teachers to support ELA Goal.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Math Learning Gains				$161,648.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1631 - Annabel C. Perry Pk 8	Other		$161,648.00
			Notes: Title 1 funds will be proposed to be used to assist in after school tutoring for students as well as for curriculum and resource teachers to support Math Goal.			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Science				$161,648.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1631 - Annabel C. Perry Pk 8	Other		$161,648.00
			Notes: Title 1 funds will be proposed to be used to assist in after school tutoring for students as well as for curriculum and resource teachers to support Science Goal.			
					Total:	$495,944.00