

Broward County Public Schools

Stirling Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Stirling Elementary School

5500 STIRLING RD, Hollywood, FL 33021

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jacqueline Arnaez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Stirling Elementary School

5500 STIRLING RD, Hollywood, FL 33021

[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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Arnaez, Jacqueline	Principal	Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable and measurable for all groups of students.
Coachman Williams, Alisia	Assistant Principal	Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable and measurable for all groups of students.
O'Neill, Marienid	Teacher, K-12	Assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable and measurable for all groups of students.
Argibay, Tanya	Instructional Coach	Assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable and measurable for all groups of students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Jacqueline Arnaez

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

524

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

3

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

2

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	68	103	86	88	82	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	29	17	30	21	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	11	18	16	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	2	5	11	4	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	2	8	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

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	82	81	95	85	70	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	11	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	

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	2	3	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	82	81	95	85	70	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	11	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	5	11	4	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	2	3	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				57%	59%	57%	54%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	60%	58%	57%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	54%	53%	57%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				57%	65%	63%	48%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	66%	62%	44%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	53%	51%	39%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	46%	53%	46%	49%	55%

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	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	62%	-13%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	59%	1%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	65%	-3%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	67%	-13%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Our school used the iReady reading and math diagnostic assessment to progress monitor our students three times during 2021 school year.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28.6	26.7	44.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	24.6	41.8
	Students With Disabilities	0	28.6	40
	English Language Learners	26.1	18.2	31.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23.4	20.6	18.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.2	18.2	15.4
	Students With Disabilities	33.3	33.3	0
	English Language Learners	13.6	15.8	27.3
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26.1	29.7	57.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.4	22.7	57.1
	Students With Disabilities	7.7	8.3	11.1
	English Language Learners	12.5	12.5	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8.8	14	31.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.6	14.5	29
	Students With Disabilities	8.3	0	0
	English Language Learners	6.3	13.3	31.3

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42.4	64.3	77.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	54.1	71.2
	Students With Disabilities	30.4	33.3	55
	English Language Learners	6.7	26.7	62.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10.7	24.4	37.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	20	40.8
	Students With Disabilities	8.7	9.1	26.7
	English Language Learners	13.3	21.4	28.6
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34.3	49.3	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	45.3	0
	Students With Disabilities	7.7	7.7	0
	English Language Learners	20	33.3	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15.7	29.6	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.2	24.5	50
	Students With Disabilities	7.7	7.7	
	English Language Learners	5	19	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22.8	22.2	43.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.5	22.7	43.5
	Students With Disabilities	9.1	9.5	21.1
	English Language Learners	5.6	0	33.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12.2	21.1	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.1	21.2	43.1
	Students With Disabilities	4.8	10	26.7
	English Language Learners	5.6	16.7	47.4
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		36	23
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	32	33		26	19	25	24				
ELL	37	25		33	18		17				
BLK	37	15		24	10		9				
HSP	42	23	27	27	16	31	22				
WHT	53	56		39	38		44				
FRL	41	27	38	29	19	14	27				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	45	41	23	42	36	12				
ELL	54	59	44	53	61	43	38				
BLK	42	53		47	53	30	29				
HSP	54	62	50	51	61	50	42				

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
WHT	72	62		72	69		55				
FRL	52	59	47	52	63	49	43				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	43	57	20	34	41	32				
ELL	49	61	76	43	53	57	40				
ASN	75			100							
BLK	41	53	54	33	31	23	31				
HSP	56	53	55	51	55	56	44				
WHT	64	64		49	32		59				
FRL	51	55	55	46	43	36	46				

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	31
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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	244
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	29
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	19
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	29
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	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
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?

Stirling Elementary demonstrated significant improvement throughout all grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas between the Fall and Spring iReady assessments.

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

The data revealed that our lowest performing subgroup were ELA Learning Gains and Students with Disabilities (SWD).

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

Last year's low performance of those identified students with disabilities may have been attributed to changes in learning modality from virtual instruction, blended learning, or to face-to-face instruction. Inconsistency with attendance had an adverse effect on these students. This year these targeted students have returned for face-to-face instruction where they will receive specific instruction by highly qualified teachers. We will monitor their progress using iReady performance data, Broward Standards Assessment data and quarterly data chats.

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

The iReady Spring data for grades 3-5 indicated that we had a total of 40.4% of students proficient in ELA. The 2021 FSA data reflects that 44% of students scored level 3 and above.

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

A focus was placed on ELA instruction using a personalized learning management system that creates individualized online instruction for students. Administrators, teachers, and students worked collaboratively to set ELA goals and monitored students' progress on achieving them. Our school-wide iReady Incentive Program helped to encourage and motivate students.

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

Small group instruction with frequent data monitoring will be implemented in order to accelerate learning.

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.

Teachers and leaders will receive ELA professional development using the Benchmark Advanced reading series and additional support with iReady. Teachers will collaborate and review ELA data during professional learning communities.

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

Teachers and administration will work collaboratively to implement and ensure sustainability by progress monitoring grade level assessments to use data to drive instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our 2021 FSA data indicates the following:
 - 29% of tested students made English Language Arts (ELA) learning gains
 - 27% of tested students with disabilities (SWD) made English Language Arts (ELA) learning gains

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, 34% of our 4th and 5th grade students will make ELA learning gains.

Monitoring: By June 2022, 32% of our 4th and 5th grade students with disabilities (SWD) will make ELA learning gains.
 Students will take ownership of their learning by maintaining and tracking their iReady progress. Teachers will assist students on setting academic goals using iReady data. iReady Reading Diagnostic Assessment data will be used to create instructional groups for remediation and enrichment. iReady Standards Mastery Checkpoints will be used to progress monitor. A comparative analysis will be conducted using data from iReady Assessment Period 1 (AP1) and iReady Assessment Period 2 (AP2) to track and monitor progress. This information will be used and discussed during data chats. Data from the Broward Standards Assessment will be used to check for standards mastery. Quarterly data chats with instructional staff and administration will be conducted to progress monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jacqueline Arnaez (jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady is the evidence-based program that will be utilized to create and guide classroom and ESSER reading groups that are adjusted based on progress monitoring data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The iReady program has standards based instruction for remediation and enrichment. Through monthly progress monitoring, students will receive immediate small group instruction support.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership team will meet with our iReady contact to determine plan for professional development (PD).
2. Instructional staff will attend iReady professional development (PD) during Professional Learning Community (PLC) days.
3. Literacy Coach will coordinate for follow-up support with iReady.
4. Administration will observe implementation of professional learning during classroom observations.
5. Class Data-Chat model will be used to progress monitor implementation of new teaching strategies with the targeted students.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Arnaez (jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Stirling Elementary School reported 0.0 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. The Positive Behavior Intervention Support Team monitors school discipline quarterly and provides guidance to teachers based on the discipline data using PBIS strategies.

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.

At Stirling Elementary School we cultivate a positive school culture by implementing school-wide rules and using Social-Emotional Learning strategies. The Power of 3 school-wide rules are reinforced throughout our school within the classroom, in the cafeteria, and during specials. Our Power of 3 school-wide rules are as follows:

- Take of yourself.
- Take care of others.
- Take care of our school.

Our school works to meet all social-emotional needs through seamless integration of SEL competencies and academic instruction. The school also affords students many opportunities to be recognized for making good choices. For example, the school participates in the Kid of Character program, service learning projects, peer mentoring programs, and intentional citizenship lessons.

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

Teachers incorporate social-emotional learning lessons in their daily routines and classroom discussions about behavioral expectations. Our school counselor, family counselor, and social worker provide assistance, interventions, and small group counseling to students and families who need additional support. Students and parents may reach out to any staff member with any concerns they may have and their issues will be resolved in a timely manner.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$16,652.00