Annabel C. Perry Pk 8 School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Annabel C. Perry Pk 8

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

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Oneal, Jennifer	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.
Laborde, Sandra	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 International Baccalaureate (IB) Magnet Coordinator at Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 is a teacher recruit from the teaching staff. The IB coordinator has 19 years of teaching experience in the classroom and is the team leader for different grade levels. During these years, the IB coordinator coached new teachers and the last three years served in a leadership role and IB coordinator. As required by the International Baccalaureate Organization, the IB coordinator reports directly to the principal and assistant principals who share the responsibilities of the IB coordinator. At Annabel C. Perry PreK-8, there is a commitment to collaborative planning of the IB written curriculum. The IB 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 IB 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 IB magnet coordinator.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
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.
Stephens-Delacruz, Marilyn	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.
Walker, Dina	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.
Said, Samia	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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process for the completion of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) at Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 includes staff, students, and parents. The staff that are included are the leadership team and support staff, including instructional coaches. In compliance with Title 1, each school year the SIP plan is reviewed and parents, students, and staff in a formal meeting. Through our SAC Committee staff, community partners, parents, and representatives for each student subgroup are represented in the review of the SIP. All stakeholders are invited to provide feedback and requests for changes that should be made. The input that is provided by our stakeholders are discussed during the SIP Review meeting at SAC and a vote to approve changes is held by the SAC Committee if quorum has been met. If there are no changes, the SAC Committee votes to maintain the SIP and it is recorded in the SAC meeting minutes, and signed by the school principal and SAC Chairperson.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Each month through the SAC meeting, all stakeholders are updated on the progress of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) by school leaders and administration. Each month, curriculum coaches and leaders provide updates in their content areas (i.e. changes to standards, finding resources to support students at home and school, tutoring opportunities, etc.) and important dates (i.e. FAST PM testing dates). The SAC meetings also provide us with the opportunity to share plans for improvements for the school to support students, family events and parent training nights, and schoolwide initiatives (i.e. Extended Learning Opportunities, tutoring, supplemental resources, etc.). Faculty and staff who are unable to attend the SAC meetings are provided with updates through school communication (i.e. Outlook email) and grade level/department meetings. On a consistent basis, all stakeholders are encouraged to review the school's SIP plan and provide feedback as we work through the year by contacting school administration, SAC Committee representatives, and/or presenting at the monthly SAC meeting. In addition, the SAC Chairperson works with school administration and instructional coaches to ensure that the action plan for the SIP are being implemented.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	34	33	28	26	22	14	8	9	8	182
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	2	8	18	18	14	65
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	8	8	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	5	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	12	13	21	21	16	29	24	23	23	182
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	6	21	16	29	44	13	18	16	163
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	1	1	13	0	0	0	10	6	32

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	9	11	19	24	20	34	25	26	24	192

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	6	14	1	1	0	0	9	37
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	14

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	26	37	25	32	13	19	8	8	8	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	9	12	18	15	11	7	73
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	32	20	26	6	18	32	134
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	4	20	13	7	15	31	22	112
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	4	1	35	9	0	1	8	8	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	4	41	31	34	28	31	34	206
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	26	37	25	32	13	19	8	8	8	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	9	12	18	15	11	7	73
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	32	20	26	6	18	32	134
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	4	20	13	7	15	31	22	112
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	4	1	35	9	0	1	8	8	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	4	41	31	34	28	31	34	206
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	41	55	53	43	57	55	34		
ELA Learning Gains				54			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			36		
Math Achievement*	43	52	55	37	47	42	22		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				65			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			21		
Science Achievement*	20	50	52	27	52	54	15		
Social Studies Achievement*	55	68	68	75	64	59	36		
Middle School Acceleration	56	72	70	77	57	51	54		
Graduation Rate		68	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		66	70			
ELP Progress	75	53	55	88	75	70	59		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	4	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	55			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	27	Yes	1	1
FRL	45			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	41			43			20	55	56			75
SWD	15			22			0	33			6	64
ELL	29			46			21				5	75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			43			20	48	59		7	79
HSP	49			45			23	82			5	75
MUL	50			40							2	
PAC												
WHT	23			31							2	
FRL	39			41			17	45	53		7	76

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	43	54	46	37	65	62	27	75	77			88
SWD	13	43	35	15	60	65	6					
ELL	39	66	60	30	65	36	23	50				88
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	51	42	35	65	63	25	72	81			83
HSP	58	74		45	68		41					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	41	54	51	35	67	67	26	74	78			80

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	34	37	36	22	22	21	15	36	54			59
SWD	7	21	24	10	16	10	3	19				
ELL	31	33		16	22		19					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	37	36	21	21	20	12	35	50			42
HSP	43	32		30	29		25					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33	35	44	22	20	18	10	32	45			58

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	31%	56%	-25%	54%	-23%
07	2023 - Spring	43%	49%	-6%	47%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	35%	49%	-14%	47%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	58%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	50%	-8%	47%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	53%	-11%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	51%	54%	-3%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	58%	51%	7%	48%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	62%	-20%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	65%	-23%	61%	-19%
08	2023 - Spring	61%	46%	15%	55%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	23%	58%	-35%	55%	-32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	3%	38%	-35%	44%	-41%
05	2023 - Spring	15%	46%	-31%	51%	-36%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	48%	12%	50%	10%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	63%	6%	63%	6%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	64%	-9%	66%	-11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST and other State assessment data, several trends emerged demonstrating a need in multiple content areas. The lowest performing data componen was on the 8th grade Statewide Science Assessment (SSA). Based on the data collected throughout the school year, there were multiple factors that contributed to the gap in proficiency, including student absenteeism and loss of staffing in the latter part of the school year. Additionally, additional Tier 1 training was needed for for instructional strategies. There was also a high number of level 1 students that required additional classroom support in Reading and ELA.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was in ELA and Reading across multiple grade levels. The largest decline was found in 5th and 8th grade ELA with a decrease of 12% each. A large contributing factor was the change in curriculum resources, and new standards (i.e. BEST Standards). Teachers needed additional training on new textbook resources and implementation of new standards. Again, the increase in student absenteeism and loss of staffing greatly contributed to the decline of proficiency.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared with the state average was found in 5th grade Math with a difference of 32%. Factors that we believe contributed to the gap was due to scheduling of Math interventions/lessons during the daily schedule. The intention of the intervention block was to support students who needed remediation, but necessary training on how to effectively use that time was not available. Also, the pacing guides were not used with fidelity and it was found that it was difficult to stay on task. The other area with the greatest gap was in 8th grade Science with a State-to-School proficiency difference of 41%.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was for 8th grade math with an increase in proficiency of 42%. To make improvements in this content area we created common planning schedules with the teachers, provided modeling in classrooms, and push-in groups with instructional coaches in classrooms, and used to data to drive daily instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The two potential areas of concern are in Science and ELA.

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

Science will be the highest priority and will be accompanied by schoolwide initiatives for teachers and staff to work on increasing Science proficiency. In addition to Science, ELA will be focus on this school year. We incorporate strategies from the Science of Reading across all content areas in an effort to increase ELA/Reading proficiency as well.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the analysis of data, our ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities, is currently not meeting the expected proficiency. As a school, this group of students had an overall proficiency of 13% as measured by the 2022-2023 FAST PM 3. Our school expectation remains that this area will increase in overall proficiency for the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Based on the 2023-2024 FAST PM 3, the goal of Annabel C. Perry PreK-8 will be to increase the overall percentage points for our Students with Disabilities by 16%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Instructional cycles at Annabel C. Perry PK-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. 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:

Sandra Laborde (sandra.laborde@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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. This ensures that the use of various intervention programs are being used 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 Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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 strategies 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Data Analysis of current standards 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: Sandra Laborde (sandra.laborde@browardschools.com)

By When: June 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the 2022-2023 Science Statewide Assessment, our overall Science proficiency percentile was the
lowest component of the school at 3% for 8th grade and 15% for 5th grade. In the course of the school year, students had difficulty retaining critical content. Our primary focus is on ensuring that all students have the opportunity to demonstrate understanding through classroom activities and on formative and summative assessments.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

At the end of the 2023-2024 school year, Annabel C. Perry PreK-8's overall science proficiency percentile will increase to 30% as measured by the 2024 Statewide Science Assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

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:

Marilyn Stephens-Delacruz (marilyn.stephens-delacruz@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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 technical 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 have real-time experiences with phenomena and through experimentation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Data Analysis of current standards 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: Kristin Chandler (kristin.chandler@browardschools.com)

By When: June 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As we have transitioned to new leadership we have been focused on maintaining the Culture of Caring by supporting teachers and students in a safe and positive learning environment.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By June 2024, 90% teachers and students will feel safe and supported by AC Perry PreK-8 as measured by quarterly teacher/student surveys.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The area will be monitored quarterly through teacher/student interest surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Oneal (jennifer.oneal@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implementation of CHAMPS as a school-wide initiative, and teacher & student incentives, and creating opportunities for teachers and students to foster positive relationships with their peers/colleagues.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the use of CHAMPS we are creating a safe environment and by providing incentives we are increasing the amount of teacher and student buy-in as we work to start new schoolwide initiatives.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Data Analysis of current school culture with initial/diagnostic survey.
2. Administer Quarterly Surveys
3. Analyze Data
4. Provide appropriate response to data (i.e. mediation, new incentive program, create a new event, etc.)

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

By When: June 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

This process is completed through our SAC meetings. Department heads and teachers are made aware of the available funding, and a proposal must be submitted to say who will benefit and how. Any stakeholders are provided who would like to present their proposal, must submit their the proposal form two weeks before the SAC meeting to be added to the agenda. At the upcoming meeting the person will share a presentation that includes the budget and cost of the materials being requested. If quorum is met by the SAC committee, a vote will be held to accept the proposal for review. At the next SAC meeting, the SAC committee will share any questions and concerns about the proposal and decide in the same meeting if the proposal will be approved.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our instructional Area of Focus this year relating to ELA in grades K-2 is phonics-based instruction when it comes to decoding and building letter sound and word knowledge. This is based on the previous year's end of year data which revealed that over 50% of students in grades K-2 were unable to read grade level texts due to not being able to decode, blend, and sound out words which ultimately impacted their comprehension. Based on this information, targeted researched based curriculum that is directly aligned with the new standards and assessments are being used. Phonics instructional blocks are built into daily lessons to ensure students are being taught phonics explicitly. In addition, ongoing data chats to progress monitor instructional cycles, a thorough RtI process to ensure targeted inventions are being used as well as ongoing PD/PLC cycles are occurring throughout the school to ensure all students are meeting the school wide goal of 55%.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Our instructional Area of Focus this year relating to ELA in grades 3-5 is standards-based instruction with a focus on vocabulary knowledge. This is based on the previous year's FSA-FAST PM 3 data which revealed that comprehension with regards to Key Ideas and Details was significantly lower than other

areas of ELA . When looking more specifically at this cluster through vocabulary based assessments and other common formative assessments, the area of Tier 3 words, using context clues, and determining base meanings of words was difficult. When students were asked to determine the main idea in both fictional and nonfictional texts, they were unable to show mastery in this area as well. In fact, based on the 2023 FAST PM assessments, 56% of third grade students scored below level 3 in ELA, 55% of 4th grade students scored below level 3 in ELA, and 69% of 5th grade students scored below level 3 in ELA. Based on this information, targeted researched based curriculum that is directly aligned with the new standards and assessments are being used. In addition, ongoing data chats
to progress monitor instructional cycles, a thorough RtI process to ensure targeted inventions are being used as well as ongoing PD/PLC cycles are occurring throughout the school to ensure all students are meeting the school wide goal of 55%.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, the number of students not reading on grade level will decrease 8% as measured on STAR assessments.
Based on last year's data, 51% of students in K-2 were not reading on grade level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024 students in 3rd - 5th grades scoring below level 3 will decrease by 10% as measured on FAST.
Based on last year's data, 55% of students scored below level 3.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Area of Focus will be monitored through Teacher-Admin data chats, Student-Teacher data chats, coaching feedback based on a walkthrough cycle of observation, and data analysis during PLCs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Laborde, Sandra, sandra.laborde@browardschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Based on the new B.E.S.T standards, the District has adopted the curriculum Benchmark Advanced to assist in instructing, remediating, and enriching students. This curriculum is fully supported by the District's Reading Plan and all the instructional focus calendars, scope and sequence and assessments are based on the validity of the program and all of its components.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

This curriculum is fully supported by the District's Reading Plan and all the instructional focus calendars, scope and sequence and assessments are based on the validity of the program and all of its components.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership 1. Ongoing professional learning on the new standards and curriculum 2. Detailed data analysis on current and lagging data trends Literacy Coaching 1. Monthly PLC's to review standards and curriculum used to gain mastery. 2. Frequent progress monitoring of instruction to identify areas of need throughout the building 3. Coaching and modeling effective standards instruction throughout all grade levels. Assessment 1. Thorough review of new F.A.S.T. assessment to understand content focus and rigor of assessments. 2. Ongoing data analysis of weekly and end of cycle assessments to identify areas in need of additional support Professional Learning 1. Targeted and focused PD's on new standards and curriculum 2. Ongoing weekly PLC's to allow opportunity to implement new learning and instructional practices. 3. District initiatives for Science of Reading implementation	Laborde, Sandra, sandra.laborde@browardschools.com

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP is disseminated through various forms to all stakeholders. As a Title 1 school, we work with community partners to provide hard-copies of the plan at their locations, the SIP is also shared on their company website. In addition, the SIP is provided to students to take home by hand, it is shared through teacher/student Canvas pages, through school-based communication programs (i.e. Class Dojo), and Parent Link. If necessary, additional copies of the SIP is help in the front office. Digital versions are available on the website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will by maintaining transparency with parents on how we are working on improving the school for students. We will also foster relationships through family events, consistent communication, and by connecting with community partners to provide resources for famiies.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school will build schedules that allow and provide students with the opportunities for enrichment and remediation in core content areas as well as provide Extended Learning Opportunities.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The funding for ELO will be provided by the District.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No