

Pinellas County Schools

# Frontier Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>27</b>

# Frontier Elementary School

6995 HOPEDALE LN, Clearwater, FL 33764

<http://www.frontier-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Heather Peters**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

## **SIP Authority**

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

We are committed to: take care of the whole child, believe the best of all stakeholders, work together as a school community, foster a growth mindset, create a safe environment.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

We are dedicated to developing students into thinkers and problem solvers who are ready to be contributing members of a diverse society.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Peters, Heather	Principal	Instructional Leader and manager of all SIP Goals
Pribble, James	Assistant Principal	Primary focus on PBIS goal, wellness goal, and assists with all other SIP goals
Johnson, Laura	Instructional Coach	Assist with tracking data on ELA and Math goals - focus on learning gains and proficiency

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/26/2018, Heather Peters

**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.*

2

**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.*

5

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

50

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	42	119	108	98	115	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	0	54	37	33	36	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

**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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Wednesday 7/8/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	69	90	95	109	103	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	547
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	13	24	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

**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	2	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	69	90	95	109	103	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	547
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	13	24	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

**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	2	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	54%	57%	58%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	59%	58%	58%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	53%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	68%	61%	63%	77%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	58%	61%	62%	77%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	48%	51%	77%	42%	47%



School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	62%	53%	53%	61%	57%	55%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

#### Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	56%	5%	58%	3%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	56%	-3%	58%	-5%
	2018	63%	51%	12%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	62%	12%	62%	12%
	2018	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%
	2018	72%	62%	10%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	65%	60%	5%	60%	5%
	2018	73%	61%	12%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	54%	8%	53%	9%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	26	30	41	23		44				
ELL	45	55		72	76		47				
BLK	45	62		55	62		53				
HSP	55	53	75	73	72		69				
MUL	64			82							
WHT	55	44	50	66	44	33	60				
FRL	48	47	63	65	55	41	59				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	41	56	82	63	79						
ELL	45	58	50	80	78	82	53				
BLK	50	41		72	74		50				
HSP	59	62	53	81	80	76	55				
MUL	71			88							
WHT	57	56	56	73	77	79	67				
FRL	56	59	55	74	77	76	56				

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

School Grade data component low performance - L25 Math Gains on 2018 - 2019 FSA - 40%

Trends - 77% (17/18) to 40% (18/19)

\*Contributing factors -

1. Decrease in instructional minutes allocated to the master schedule.
2. Rearrangement of sequencing of math instruction

According to MAP projection data and AAR reports we would have seen improvement in math on the 19-20 FSA.

Projection -

Math Proficiency projection: 64%

Learning Gains projection: 62%

However we continue to struggle with learning gains for our L25 scholars. Our L25 gains would have dropped again.

L25 Learning Gains projection: 33%

ESSA data component, low performance - SWD on 2018 - 2019 FSA - 38%

Trends - 38% proficient in ELA and 63% proficient in math (17/18) to 38% (18/19)

Based on projections and AAR reports we would have seen another decrease in the learning gains of our lowest 25% or scholars. Most of our L25 students are in our SWD classification.

\*Contributing factors -

1. Change in VE resource teachers
2. Lack of common planning time between gen ed teachers and VE resource teachers
3. Staffing cut to 2 1/2 VE teachers in 19 - 20 vs 3 VE teachers in 18 - 19

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

Learning gains in our lowest 25% of students for math showed the greatest decline. Trends - 77% (17/18) to 40% (18/19) - 37% decline.

According to MAP projection data and AAR reports we would have seen improvement in math on the 19-20 FSA.

Projection -

Math Proficiency projection: 64%

Learning Gains projection: 62%

However we continue to struggle with learning gains for our L25 scholars. Our L25 gains would have dropped again.

L25 Learning Gains projection: 33%

\*Contributing factors -

1. Decrease in instructional minutes allocated to math in the master schedule.
2. Rearrangement of sequencing of math instruction
3. Newly implemented math curriculum and lack of teacher familiarity with curriculum

**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**

Our largest gap compared to the state was learning gains of our lowest 25% of students for math.

\*Contributing factors -

1. Decrease in instructional minutes allocated to the master schedule.
2. Rearrangement of sequencing of math instruction

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

Science is the only area that we showed a gain from last year to this year. We implemented ELP that focused primarily on science standards and reteaching the areas that our students were not demonstrating proficiency.

According to MAP projections and AAR reports, we would have seen an increase in overall ELA performance and learning gains had we been able to take the 2019 - 2020 FSA.

Actual Last Year: Projected for 2019 - 2020:

ELA Proficiency: 54% ELA Proficiency projected: 60%

Overall Learning Gains: 49% Overall Learning Gains projected: 58%

We increased minutes of independent reading in classrooms especially in grades 3 - 5.

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

Attendance remains an ever increasing area of concern. Our numbers of students with 10% or more of absences more than doubled from 2018 - 2019 to 2019 - 2020. Some of this is contributed to the fourth quarter of digital learning. Prior to the switch to digital learning we still had 120 students with 10% or more absences. If students are not here to receive instruction they will not experience growth. Many of our most struggling scholars

are often tardy. We need to continue to work with families to ensure children are here and on time as well as adjust and monitor our attendance plan.

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

1. Students with Disabilities in all subjects
2. Learning gains of our lowest 25% of students in math
3. Attendance

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our 2018 - 2019 level of performance was 54% of students performing at a proficient level in grades 3-5, as evidenced in the 2019 FSA ELA data. Based on Winter 2019 - 2020 MAP scores and projections, we would have reached 60% on the 2019 - 2020 FSA had we been able to take it. We expect our performance level to be 70% by the Spring FSA for 2020 - 2021.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percent of all grade 3 -5 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 54% on the 2018 - 2019 FSA to 70% on the 2020 - 2021 FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback. The most important component of the literacy block is ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate grade-level text (while applying foundational skills) with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The problem/gap is occurring because students are doing limited amounts of real world reading and writing with high-quality feedback and opportunities to implement the feedback. If immense amounts of reading and writing with feedback would occur, the problem would be reduced by 16%.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 68% of students in grades 3-5, as evidenced in the 2018 - 2019 Math FSA performance. Based on MAP scores and projections, we would have reached 64% on the 2019 - 2020 FSA had we been able to take it. We expect our performance level to be 78% by the Spring FSA for 2020 - 2021.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of all students scoring at a Level 3 or higher on FSA will increase from 68% on the 2018 - 2019 FSA to 78% on the 2020 - 2021 FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, Number Routines, and other standards-aligned resources. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The problem/gap is occurring because student-centered daily instruction which includes practice on rigorous mathematical tasks with multiple steps and/or solutions is not occurring daily. If teacher use of student-centered instruction and implementation of real world, complex math problems would occur, the problem would be reduced by 10%.

**Action Steps to Implement**

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 62% Proficient, as evidenced by the 2019 SSA data. Based on projections from beginning and mid-year science diagnostic, we would have dropped to a 51% on the 2019 - 2020 SSA had we been able to take it. We expect our performance level to be 70% by Spring 2021.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percent of all students achieving science proficiency will increase from 62% on the 2018 - 2019 SSA to 70%, as measured by the 2020 - 2021 science SSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment as well as reteaching standards from 5th grade cycle assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The problem/gap is occurring because students in fifth grade are lacking knowledge of the content standards from 3rd and 4th grade, which are included on the SSA. If a plan for ongoing review of previously taught content would occur, the problem would be reduced by 8% from the 2018 - 2019 SSA to the 2020 - 2021 SSA.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*



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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 38% proficient, as evidenced in 2018 - 2019 FSA performance data. We expect our performance level to be 62% by Spring 2021.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percent of SWD students achieving proficiency will increase from 38% to 62%, as measured by FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Collect and interpret data from Dream Box, Istation, PM, and MAP to monitor progress with IEP goals and objectives and drive instruction based on student need, including regular and purposeful adjustment to accommodations and interventions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The problem/gap is occurring because data is not utilized frequently enough to drive instruction and address student needs of grade level standards. If rigorous core instruction based on data driven decisions would occur, the problem would be reduced by 24%.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#5. Other specifically relating to Bridging the Gap**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 57% of Black students are considered proficient in ELA and 61% in Math as evidenced in the 2018 - 2019 ELA and Math FSA. Based on MAP scores and projections, we would have reached 43% proficiency in ELA and 52% proficiency in Math on the 2019 - 2020 FSA had we been able to take it. We expect our performance level to be 70% in ELA and 75% in Math by Spring 2021.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percent of black students scoring proficiency on ELA will increase from 57% on the 2018 - 2019 FSA to 70%, as measured by the ELA FSA. The percent of black students scoring proficiency on Math will increase from 61% to 75% as measured by the Math FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans and texts.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The problem/gap is occurring because CRT strategies and restorative practices are not used with fidelity in classrooms. If CRT and restorative practices would occur with fidelity, we would see students more engaged during instruction which would improve their overall learning gains as evidenced in MAP scores and FSA data.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	The percent of Level 4 and 5 Gifted Students is 51% in ELA and 80% in math as evidenced by the 2018 - 2019 FSA results.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	The percent of level 4 and 5 gifted students will increase to 82% in ELA and 90% in math.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of every student.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Data identifying a significant number of underperforming gifted students was utilized to determine a more suitable grouping strategy for gifted learners. The work of Marcia Gentry (Vanderbilt University) was studied to support the initiative to cluster gifted students for the upcoming year.

**Action Steps to Implement**

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our 2018 - 2019 level of performance was 58% of students performing at a proficient level in grades 3-5, as evidenced in the 2019 FSA ELA data. Based on MAP scores and projections, we would have reached 53% on the 2019 - 2020 FSA had we been able to take it. We expect our performance level to be 70% by the Spring FSA for 2020 - 2021.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of all grade 3 - 5 EL students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 58% on the 2018 - 2019 FSA to 70% on the 2020 - 2021 FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Each teacher plans and delivers lessons that meet the needs of EL students based on English language proficiency levels, and length of time in U.S. schools to ensure academic success of each EL students in their class.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The problem/gap is occurring because EL students are not receiving instruction differentiated based on the MPIs and Can do descriptors. If teacher plans and lesson delivery met the needs of EL students based on English proficiency levels , the problem would be reduced by 12%.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>As the result of equity-centered problem solving within an MTSS framework, Frontier developed an equity goal to build relational capacity, empower student voice, and hold high expectations in the following school improvement areas for equity systems change:</p> <p>Whole school professional Development and increasing the use of equitable practices. (equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching, restorative practices, etc.)</p> <p>In order to enhance learning and achievement, the Frontier team will provide instruction that is culturally affirming to all scholars, and be provided actionable feedback and grading that ensures mastery of grade level standards across the year, resulting in success on MAP testing and FSA. This area of focus impacts student learning and success and changes in staff practice.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>To address mindset shift for the adoption of equitable practices we will participate in whole school equity-centered PD. We will also strengthen equity-centered PLCs, SBLT, and CST meetings. Our current data illustrates 33% of black scholars performing below grade level compared to 22% of our white scholars as evidenced by our ELA Winter MAP data and 35% of our black scholars performing below grade level compared to 27% of our white scholars based on Math Winter MAP data. We will create a positive impact on student achievement by strengthening culturally relevant practices through sustained whole group professional development. We will measure progress by recording the number of PD sessions and the number of teachers who attend the PD. We will also ensure consistent attendance of all instructional staff at each weekly PLC. We will measure medium-term outcomes by examining changes in teacher practice using a CRT classroom walkthrough tool and reporting the number of teachers who consistently practice CR as observed in classroom walkthroughs. We will measure long-term student outcomes by reducing the percentage of black students performing below grade level in ELA from 33% and Math from 35% to align with how white scholars are performing with the goal of reducing the achievement gap.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Equitable practices - equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching, restorative practices</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>These strategies and practices were identified using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP).</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#9. Other specifically relating to Reading Recovery**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 45% of 1st grade students are performing at a proficient level, as evidenced in the 2020 Winter MAP data. We expect our performance level to be 70% by Spring of 2021.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percent of 1st graders showing proficiency in ELA will increase from 45% to 70% as measured by the 2021 Spring ELA MAP assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Reading Recovery is a highly effective short-term intervention of one-to-one tutoring for low-achieving first graders. The intervention is most effective when it is available to all students who need it and is used as a supplement to effective classroom instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The problem/gap is occurring because students are doing limited amounts of reading and writing with high-quality feedback and opportunities to implement the feedback. If immense amounts of reading and writing with feedback would occur, the problem would be reduced by 25%.

**Action Steps to Implement**

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#10. Other specifically relating to School Climate/Conditions for Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior for the 2019 - 2020 school year is 202 total referrals from 61 students. 18 students have 3 or more referrals. We expect our performance level to be improved through a 30% reduction in the number of students by the end of the 2020/21 school year.

**Measureable Outcome:** The number of all students with discipline incidents will decrease by 30% as evidenced through student office referral forms. This would bring the number of total referrals to 141 or fewer.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** James Pribble (pribblej@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students.  
Implement engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students need positive relationships to allow them to access, engage, and express learning in the classroom.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#11. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance for parents feeling the school helps them better understand the learning goals for their child is 89% based on the 2019 - 2020 annual Title I survey. We will increase the perception by 3% as measured by the Title I Annual Parent Survey for 2021.

**Measureable Outcome:** The number of parents who feel they better understand the learning goals and grade level standards for their child will increase to a minimum of 92%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Parents who understand learning targets for their child can be more involved and help their child better with homework to deepen the understanding of taught concepts through reinforcement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If parents felt more comfortable with learning goals and grade level standards, the problem would decrease by 3% and student achievement at all levels would increase.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*



**#12. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is bronze level, as evidenced in the Alliance for a Healthier Generation’s Healthy Schools Program framework. We expect our performance level to be bronze by Spring 2021. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of monitoring of the program and PBIS food rewards do not adhere to smart snack guidelines.

**Measureable Outcome:** We will complete all requirements in order to achieve silver status as measured by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation’s Healthy Schools program by Spring 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** If our healthy school team collaborated to monitor the implementation of administrative guidelines for wellness across the different grade levels, our school will have a greater opportunity to increase our adherence to smart snack guidelines and become eligible for recognition.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If a monitoring calendar and planned events would occur, we would improve to a silver level by achieving 100% of the requirements.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#13. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** With the change to online learning for quarter 4, our overall attendance rate for all students fell to 63.5% as evidenced by student attendance data in School Profiles. For the 2020 - 2021 school year, we will increase the attendance rate to 90%. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because of the difficulty for parents during the quick transition and also the lack of importance placed on online learning for quarter 4.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 36.5% to 10%, as measured by student attendance data in School Profiles.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all tiers on an ongoing basis.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If follow through on absences and procedures would occur by teachers and the child study team beginning early in the year, the number of students missing more than 10% of school would be reduced by 26.5%.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**NA**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

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

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

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

Frontier School believes in involving parents in all aspects of their child's education, therefore our school encourages parents to become active members of our School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Association (PTA). This ensure that parents will be provided opportunities to give input in the development and decision-making process of all activities related to the school. Frontier School seeks to provide excellent customer service and availability for parents. The administrators make themselves available to parents to the largest degree possible when parents come to the school with questions or concerns. The leadership and staff of Frontier Elementary have a strong belief in the importance of parental involvement and therefore are flexible with times and days for parent involvement events and include mornings and evening and different days of the week for family meeting/events. We provide an interpreter and digital equipment for family members whose primary language is Spanish. We also plan to make attending SAC meetings through a virtual platform such as Microsoft Teams an option so parents can participate from home or work if needed. We utilize our school facebook page to communicate with parents and showcase the many wonderful things their children do while on campus. We offer curriculum/family sessions to help parents better understand standards, assessments, and online programs. During these sessions parents will learn all about grade level standards, programs that are utilized to ensure academic success, and assessments taken during the school year. It is our goal to make parents and our community members our full time partners as we strive to ensure all students at Frontier Elementary experience success.

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

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

**Part V: Budget**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	100-Salaries	1341 - Frontier Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Staff stipends for collaborative planning and data analysis for all SIP goals.</i>			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the Gap	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Reading Recovery	\$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School Climate/Conditions for Learning	\$0.00
11	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
12	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools	\$0.00
13	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$3,000.00</b>