Frontier Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/25/2018

2018-19 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: B 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: C
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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.](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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Peters, Heather	Principal
Principal	
Pribble, James	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Johnson, Laura	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	

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	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
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
43

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	24	30	18	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	3	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	4	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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%
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	
Number of students enrolled	69 (0)	90 (0)	95 (0)	109 (0)	103 (0)	81 (0)	547 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	17 ()	13 ()	24 ()	11 ()	10 ()	75 (0)
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)	0 (0)	3 (0)	13 (0)	2 (0)	18 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	19 (0)	30 (0)	52 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

NOTE: 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
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%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
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
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

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

English Language Learners

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

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
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
Hispanic Students	
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
Multiracial Students	
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
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	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 - 40% (2018-19)
Trends - 77% (17/18) to 40% (18/19)
*Contributing factor to our lowest performance is the decrease in instructional minutes allocated to the master schedule.
*Rearrangement of sequencing of math instruction

ESSA data component, low performance - SWD - 38% (2018-19)
Trends - 38% proficient in ELA and 63% proficient in math (17/18) to 38% (18/19)
*Identified factors - Change in VE resource teachers, also lack of common planning time between gen ed teachers and VE resource teachers

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.
*Contributing factor to our lowest performance is the decrease in instructional minutes allocated to the master schedule.
*Rearrangement of sequencing of math instruction

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 factor to our lowest performance is the decrease in instructional minutes allocated to the master schedule.
*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.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance remains an area of concern. 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. Overall learning gains in ELA for all grades and subgroups
4. Overall ELA proficiency
5. Of our ESSA subgroups our white students have the lowest scores with the exception of the SWD group.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 54% of students are performing at a proficient level in grades 3-5, as evidenced in the 2019 FSA ELA data. We expect our performance level to be 70% by Spring of 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all grade 3 -5 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 54% to 70% as measured by 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 & apply foundation 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 Step	
Description	1. Provide PD and coaching on overall strategies that allow teachers opportunity to engage students in higher level tasks and immense amounts of reading and writing that promote independence and collaboration. 2. Incorporate AVID strategies and thinking maps to support students in text annotation, writing, and collaboration on complex tasks. 3. Walk through and evaluation feedback need to focus on the instructional model and ensuring mini lessons are within the time constraints to allow large amounts of time for independent practice. 4. Focus on the Gradual Release of Responsibility model to ensure a focus on a variety of instructional methods that increase student engagement and accountability. 5. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and analyze data in PLC to inform instruction in whole group, small group, as well as one to one instruction. 6. Utilize and monitor the implementation of Can Do Descriptors and the Model Performance Indicators in the planning and practice within all classrooms to ensure the instruction matches the needs of EL students and aligns with grade level standards.
Person Responsible	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 68% of students in grades 3-5 a, as evidenced in Math FSA performance. We expect our performance level to be 80% by Spring 2020.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students scoring at a Level 3 or higher on FSA will increase from 68% to 80%, as measured by Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines with fidelity. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLC, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring because students need student-centered daily instruction which includes practice on rigorous mathematical tasks with multiple steps and/or solutions. If teacher use of student-centered instruction and implementation of real world, complex math problems would occur, the problem would be reduced by 12%.

Action Step	
Description	1. Ensure that rigorous student-centered instruction occurs daily throughout all classrooms. 2. Utilize mathematical resources including Ready Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, Number Routines, math tools, and academic games to engage all mathematical learners. 3. Define scaffolding to teachers in terms of teacher/student roles during math instruction. Ensure understanding of how teaching should move from conceptual to procedural to real world, and this progression defines rigor. 4. Facilitate mathematics-focused, consistent and sustained professional development with the assistance of the Math Leadership Team through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly PLC. 5. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment. Data includes unit assessments, exit tickets, MAP, MFAS, and illustrative mathematics.
Person Responsible	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 62% Proficient, as evidenced in student performance of the SSA. We expect our performance level to be 70% by Spring 2020.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving science proficiency will increase from 62% to 70%, as measured by the 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%.

Action Step	
Description	1. Utilize the science diagnostic data in September to determine key gaps in student learning and student misconception. Develop a calendar with 5th grade teachers for review. 2. Utilize unit assessments and assessment poster routine 3. Build in the nature of science skills throughout the all units to ensure students are familiar with conducting science experiments and the language that is used to describe the steps. 4. Utilize Thinking Maps and AVID strategies, including writing across the content and reading nonfiction texts to help build background knowledge in science and provide students the opportunity to reflect on learning. 5. Implement the 10-70-20 routine with fidelity in grades 3-5 in both core and science labs. Conduct Learning Walks to monitor instruction. 6. 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.
Person Responsible	James Pribble (pribblej@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap Plan: Black Student Achievement
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 57% of Black students are considered proficient in ELA and 61% in Math as evidenced in the ELA and Math FSA. We expect our performance level to be 70% in ELA and 80% in Math by Spring 2020.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of black students scoring proficiency on ELA will increase from 57% to 70%, as measured by the ELA FSA. The percent of black students scoring proficiency on Math will increase from 61% to 80% 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 Step	
Description	1. During data chats with teachers, make sure that the breakdown of student performance includes that of black students. Discuss with teachers strategies that can be used to meet the needs of these learners. 2. Provide Professional development in AVID & CRT strategies specifically to meeting the needs of black students. Model these strategies during curriculum meetings and PLC. 3. Provide support and professional development in Restorative Practices, especially circles and SEL. 4. Look at data and classroom instruction from a lens of equity, using the expertise from the Equity Champions. 5. Conduct walk-through observations with district personnel to monitor fidelity of CRT/6 M's strategies throughout the school and support with embedded coaching as needed. 6. Include CRT/6M's in lesson planning sessions with teachers to ensure they are throughout and purposeful, guiding students to high levels of rigor. 7. Provide ongoing Equity with Excellence Professional Development to all staff.
Person Responsible	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	School Climate/Conditions for Learning
Rationale	Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 164 discipline incidents received by 42 students. We expect our performance level to be improved through a 20% reduction in the number of students by the end of the 2019/20 school year.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of all students with discipline incidents will decrease by 20% as evidenced through student office referral forms.
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 Step	
Description	1. Administration and committee members will develop and implement a cohesive plan for documenting behavior and teacher strategies prior to referrals being given. 2. Continue school-wide roll-out and development plan of RP/SEL to improve school climate and culture. 3. Built in equity trainings throughout the year with more equity champions supporting teachers after trainings. 4. Teachers will be supported in utilizing 6 M's in lesson planning and instruction. 5. Review student and teacher data with staff and SBLT quarterly and collect teacher input.
Person Responsible	James Pribble (pribblej@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our current attendance rate for all students is 82.7% as evidenced by student attendance data in School Profiles. We will increase the attendance rate to 90%. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because of inconsistent follow up with processes when addressing chronic student absences and family vacations taken during instructional time.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 17.3% to 8.3%, 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 absence processes and procedures would occur beginning early in the year, the number of students missing more than 10% of school would be reduced by 9%.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff. 2. Clearly define the resources available and processes used for attendance of students across all tier levels. 3. Review and Implement attendance incentive program and competitions. 4. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance. 5. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a bi-weekly basis. 6. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-weekly basis that includes parent contact after the first absence for children who have a consistent pattern of attendance issues. 7.Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes (e.g. Pending entries cleared).
Person Responsible	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 2 parents attending PTA meetings and holding elected positions, as evidenced in PTA board meeting minutes. We expect the number of parents attending PTA meetings to significantly increase by the end of the 2019 - 2020 school year. We also want to significantly increase the number of parents who attend educational events such as math night etc. In 2018 - 2019, we had 75 attendees at Math night. We will double the number of participants this year.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of parents actively involved in PTA will increase to a minimum of 5, as measured by PTA meeting minutes and elected office positions. The number of participants at math night will double from 75 to 150.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure parents are participating in PTA opportunities through active recruitment and communication.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If active recruitment and communication by the principal would occur, the problem would be reduced by 50%

Action Step	
Description	1. Network with parents to actively recruit involvement in PTA and encourage participation in educational events. 2. Effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices. 3. Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home. 4. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students. 5. Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners. 6. Written and oral communication will be provided for parents in English and Spanish. Translators will be available at all parent meetings, school events, and in the school office to provide translation services to ensure that parents are able to fully participate in parent meetings. When other language supports are needed, the school will use district provided resources for translation. The English Language Survey results will be used to determine the number and specific needs for translations into a language other than English. 7. Hold family centered events such as Meet and Greet, Open House, Holiday Celebration, Family Math Night, STEM night, Family Game Night, Celebration of Learning, and Family Reading Night.

Person Responsible	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is approaching 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 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of monitoring of the program and PBIS food rewards do not adhere to smart snack guidelines.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will complete all requirements in order to achieve bronze status as measured by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools program by Spring 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Pribble (pribblej@pcsb.org)
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 bronze level by achieving 100% of the requirements.
Action Step	
Description	1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individuals including, but not limited to: PE Teacher/Health Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, and Cafeteria Manager. 2. Attend district-supported professional development 3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment 4. Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan
Person Responsible	James Pribble (pribblej@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Students with Disabilities (as appropriate based on ESSA data)
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 38% proficient, as evidenced in FSA performance data. We expect our performance level to be 62% by Spring 2019.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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	Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring because students struggle in core due to many learning gaps. If rigorous core instruction with scaffolded supports would occur, the problem would be reduced by 17%.

Action Step	
Description	1. Work with ESE teachers in writing the master schedule to ensure that supports can be provided to students both in and out of core. Allocate a Title One Hourly teacher to support these students as well. 2. Collect data and monitor progress towards IEP goals and ensure collaboration between the ESE and general education teachers to best support students. Gradually reduce ESE supports to foster student independence as needed. 3. Plan intentionally for specially designed instruction to address IEP goals and grade level standards. Use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills as a pathway to grade level work. 4. Provide differentiated individualized and/or small group instruction aligned to grade level standards and break down complex instructions and skill for students. Use visual supports and prompts to support students through transitions and longer tasks. 5. Utilize scaffolds such as annotated texts, sentence frames, specific works spaces, or technology to ensure that all students have access to the grade level materials 6. 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 & apply foundation skills, with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback. 7. Ensure ESE staff participate in DWT opportunities that are recommended for ESE teachers.

Person Responsible	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

#10	
Title	Gifted
Rationale	The percent of Level 4 and 5 Gifted Students is 51% in ELA and 80% in math as evidenced in FSA results.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of level 4 and 5 gifted students will increase to 82% in ELA and 90% in math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	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 as well as clustering gifted students into gifted micro-credentialed classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	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 Step	
Description	1. Teachers intentionally plan for differentiation (using MAP or FSA data) for gifted learners and administrators monitor and provide feedback. 2. Teachers/Staff obtain the gifted micro-credential and/or the gifted endorsement so that they can better differentiate for gifted learners. 3. Cluster group gifted and talented students so that the process of differentiating is more effective for gifted learners. 4. Pre-test gifted students in order to better identify and meet their needs through differentiation. 5. Pace learning for gifted learners in response to student individual needs while maintaining the district scope and sequence for gifted learners.
Person Responsible	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

#11	
Title	Reading Recovery
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 38% of 1st grade students are performing at a proficient level, as evidenced in the 2019 Spring MAP data. We expect our performance level to be 75% by Spring of 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of 1st graders showing proficiency in ELA will increase from 38% to 75% as measured by MAP.
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 37%.
Action Step	
Description	1. Individual students receive a half-hour lesson each school day for 12 to 20 weeks with a specially trained Reading Recovery teacher. 2. Professional development for all Reading Recovery professionals to develop observational skills and a repertoire of intervention procedures tailored to meet the individual needs of at-risk students. 3. Incorporate a team planning approach between Reading Recovery teachers and the 1st grade instructional team in order to align student goals and academic language.
Person Responsible	Heather Peters (petersh@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA				$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1341 - Frontier Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,500.00
			Notes: Staff participation in TDEs for all SIP goals.			
	6300	100-Salaries	1341 - Frontier Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,500.00
			Notes: Stipends for collaborative planning and data analysis for all SIP goals.			
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Mathematics**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap Plan: Black Student Achievement**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: School Climate/Conditions for Learning**				**$0.00**
6	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Attendance**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement**				**$0.00**
8	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools**				**$0.00**
9	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities (as appropriate based on ESSA data)**				**$0.00**
10	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Gifted**				**$0.00**
11	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Reading Recovery**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$3,000.00**