
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Pinellas Park Elementary School

7520 52ND ST N, Pinellas Park, FL 33781

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

Demographics

Principal: Lori Frodine

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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

All stakeholders will work together in a cooperative partnership which will enable our students to be-come contributing citizens and lifelong learners. Together we will provide a balanced curriculum, which is driven by data and based on individual needs.

Provide the school's vision statement

As a community we will provide the necessary support to all students, so that they will succeed and reach the highest level of student achievement.

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
Frodine, Lori	Principal	
Vargus, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Hasson, Laura	Instructional Coach	
Sexton, Samantha	Instructional Coach	
Borden, Misha	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2020, Lori Frodine

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.*

0

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

37

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	36	63	86	96	71	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	40	36	30	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	43	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	43	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	2	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/29/2020

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	35	97	93	89	89	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	0	25	18	18	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	9	7	9	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	29	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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	3	0	4	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	35	97	93	89	89	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	0	25	18	18	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	9	7	9	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	29	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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	3	0	4	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	38%	54%	57%	37%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	59%	58%	34%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	54%	53%	26%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	57%	61%	63%	46%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	56%	61%	62%	41%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	48%	51%	34%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	46%	53%	53%	36%	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	34%	56%	-22%	58%	-24%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	56%	-19%	58%	-21%
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
	2018	37%	50%	-13%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	64%	-3%	64%	-3%
	2018	42%	62%	-20%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	44%	60%	-16%	60%	-16%
	2018	37%	61%	-24%	61%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
	2018	36%	57%	-21%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	18	32	29	31	48	40	13				
ELL	37	41		67	72		24				
ASN	55	59		81	77		70				
BLK	30	42	55	40	36	30	33				
HSP	43	48		59	57	40	59				
MUL	21	67		42	53						
WHT	39	37	32	59	58	42	44				
FRL	34	43	45	53	54	46	41				

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	17	28	16	20	26	27	13				
ELL	44	40		53	24						
ASN	73	59		76	52		90				
BLK	13	22		28	48		17				
HSP	33	34		40	34		18				
MUL	33			47							
WHT	39	33	27	47	40	30	34				
FRL	32	35	28	42	41	34	29				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
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	50
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

Overall ELA Achievement is our lowest area scoring 38% last year and 37% the year before. Factors contributing to this is low reading levels in primary grades and a lack of differentiated instruction including small group.

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

Our greatest decline was in 3rd grade ELA going from 37% down to 34%. Additionally, our ELL's also showed a decline going from 44% to 37%. The primary factors was lack of differentiated instruction specifically including effect small group reading groups being pulled regularly.

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 greatest gap when compared to the State is in our ELA Achievement 38% PPE and 57% State. Again this is contributed to with low reading levels in primary grades and a lack of differentiated instruction including small group.

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

Overall our Math Achievement showed the greatest improvement going from 46% to 57%. We incorporated small group math differentiation groups to support struggling students while focusing on highly engaging real world math instruction.

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

Third grade Retention's were higher than expected and are a major concern going into the next school year. We will focus on training teachers to ensure 3rd grade students are meeting and exceeding the portfolio expectations.

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

1. ELA Achivment K-5 through effective differentiation strategies including small group instruction
2. L25 in ELA & Math through targeted intervention strategies including small group instruction
3. Math Achievement through continued use highly engaging math instruction
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Focus will be given in the area of Differentiation for ELA campus wide. Students individual needs must be taken into account in order to provide the best instruction for each student. Reading campus wide is our lowest performing subject as measured by FSA. Data will be used to identify each students strengths and weaknesses and then an individual plan will be created and implemented by each teacher to address every students needs.
Measureable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year all students in grade 3-5 will improve their reading proficiency by 7% as measured by the Reading FSA, going from 38% to 45%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori Frodine (frodinel@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitate ELA PLC's that have a consistent and sustained professional development focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment, while utilizing data practices to lead discussions on how best to differentiate instruction for students needs. Use the Daily Five CAFE (research based) strategies for grouping and data analysis and differentiation of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strong PLC collaboration allows growth of teachers ability to track and use data effectively while also sharing best practices relating to instructional methods used. Differentiation of instruction allows students to be more successful because teachers can individualize instruction based on student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

- Use of Daily Five Differentiation Practices Kinder-5th grades to provide consistency, student-centered, data driven instruction for all students.
- Use of common assessments and targeted data tracking to ensure instruction relates to each students individual needs.
- Provide targeted Intervention Plans for struggling students which will include push-in, pull-out, after school, and Saturday small group instruction.
- Implementation of Writers Workshop K-5 will provide a consistent and systematic approach for our writing program.

Person Responsible Lori Frodine (frodinel@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Focus will be given in the area of Engagement for Math campus wide. Students must engage with math manipulatives and real world application to strength their understanding of math. Math campus wide is our although performs higher than reading as measured by FSA, is still lower than comparable schools. Data will be used to track effective implementation of math strategies that engage students throughout the lesson.
Measureable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year all students in grade 3-5 will improve their math proficiency by 8% as measured by the Math FSA, going from 57% to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori Frodine (frodinel@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitate Math PLC's that have a consistent and sustained professional development focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment, while utilizing data practices to lead discussions on how best to engage students during math instruction. Use the Daily Five (research based) strategies for grouping and data analysis and daily use of math manipulatives will be focused on engaging students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strong PLC collaboration allows growth of teachers ability to track and use data effectively while also sharing best practices relating to instructional methods used. Use of high engagement strategies along with the use of hands on real world examples in math will increase students overall improvement in math.

Action Steps to Implement

- Use of Daily Five Practices Kinder-5th grades to provide consistency, student-centered, data driven instruction for all students.
- Use of common assessments and targeted data tracking will allow us to track the increased level of engagement.
- Provide targeted Intervention Plans for struggling students which will include push-in, pull-out, after school, and Saturday small group instruction.

Person Responsible Lori Frodine (frodinel@pcsb.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Focus will be given to creating each classroom as a positive Restorative driven classroom. Teachers will be trained in the campus specific Restorative Practices Expectations & the Positive Behavior Intervention Plans in order to support all types of students. By ensuring each classroom is a Restorative Classroom, campus discipline calls will decrease and our positive behavior plan and incentives will help create a very strong and positive school wide culture.

Measureable Outcome: During the 2020-2021 school year the number of teachers needing specialized training/support in the area of Restorative Practices will decrease by 40%, as measured by our MTSS Coach Support Plans, going from 12 teachers to 7 teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lori Frodine (frodinel@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Restorative Practice and Positive Behavior Incentives are a proven approach to creating a positive school environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on our student population, most students coming from low income homes and many coming with trauma backgrounds, it is very important for the school to provide social & emotional support to our students. One way to fulfill this is through focusing on Positive Behavior Expectations and Incentives rather than on punitive punishment.

Action Steps to Implement

- Provide campus wide ongoing Restorative Practice Training by authorized campus trainers.
- Provide ongoing support through our MTSS Coach in the area of behavior coaching to teachers.
- Campus Wide Positive Behavior System (Bear Hugs) and the creation our a new School Store for students (Bear Den).

Person Responsible Lori Frodine (frodinel@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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.

Pinellas Park Elementary will continue to engage our parents and community by offering monthly events as outlined in our PFEP.

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

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$67,088.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3391 - Pinellas Park Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$46,136.00
<i>Notes: Hourly Teachers to support small group instruction</i>						
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	3391 - Pinellas Park Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$4,117.00
<i>Notes: Training provided to teachers.</i>						
	5100	510-Supplies	3391 - Pinellas Park Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$16,835.00
<i>Notes: Instructional Materials for classrooms</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$64,610.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3391 - Pinellas Park Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$64,610.00
<i>Notes: Math Coach</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				\$65,976.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

Pinellas - 3391 - Pinellas Park Elementary Schl - 2020-21 SIP

	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3391 - Pinellas Park Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$65,976.00
			<i>Notes: MTSS Coach</i>			
Total:						\$197,674.00