Pinellas County Schools

Perkins Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Perkins Elementary School

2205 18TH AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

http://www.perkins-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Laura Kranzel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: B 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
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.

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

The mission of Perkins Elementary School is to provide a positive learning environment and quality educational experiences, thus enabling our students to reach their full potential academically, socially, creatively, and culturally through the cooperative efforts of the family, school and community.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title
Kranzel, Laura	Principal
Principal	
Stickles, Kimberly	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
EETEN, JAYA	Instructional Technology
Instructional Technology	
Lennox, Daniel	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Ekstrom, Christine	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	88	88	90	91	86	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more referrals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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)

28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/23/2019

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	5	4	6	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	66%	54%	57%	59%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	59%	58%	45%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	54%	53%	32%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	64%	61%	63%	74%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	57%	61%	62%	63%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	48%	51%	42%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	69%	53%	53%	69%	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	88 (0)	88 (0)	90 (0)	91 (0)	86 (0)	87 (0)	530 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	5 ()	3 ()	5 ()	6 ()	0 ()	19 (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)	2 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	19 (0)	20 (0)	41 (0)
One or more referrals	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	2 (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	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	56%	9%	58%	7%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
	2018	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
	2018	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
	2018	80%	61%	19%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
	2018	69%	57%	12%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	14	26	25	24	29	19	17				
BLK	43	57	52	43	37	15	31				

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
HSP	88	77		85	69						
MUL	75			53							
WHT	81	73		81	73		95				
FRL	48	58	50	46	42	18	50				

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	25	24	23	40	48	40					
BLK	32	35	30	50	45	27	29				
HSP	79	32		96	84		100				
MUL	30			90							
WHT	77	57	36	87	73	77	86				
FRL	41	29	27	59	56	38	31				

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	57
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	40
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	80
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	64
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	81
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	45
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

The lowest performance is in the L25 gains for both ELA and Math. Our ESSA and subgroup data show that our students in the categories of Black/African American and Students With Disabilities score lower than the students in the other categories. They are scoring below the 41% threshold.

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

The 2018/2019 scores show a decrease in all of the sections of Math. Our proficiency overall dropped by 10 points, our Learning Gains by 6 points, and our L25 Learning Gains plummeted 17 points. The Math scores in regard to proficiency dropped 7 points in the 4th grade category, however those students in that cohort actually gained 3 points. 5th Grade Math scores, however showed a drop of 20 points for the cohort and 24 points for the grade level category. Possible contributing factors are: new teachers to the grade levels and focus on ELA.

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

2018/2019 proficiency scores show that our school is performing higher than both state and district in all subjects.

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

ELA showed the most improvement overall. Overall proficiency increased 7 points, Learning Gains increased 22 points, and L25 Learning Gains increased 20 points. The actions that we took included very specific data mining to assess progress and needs. Interventions and progress monitoring were put into place. Data was reviewed with interventions fading, altering or increasing as needed. School wide there was an increase of a focus on literacy and celebrations for highest gains monthly as indicated by iStation scores.

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

Our areas of concern are SWD and Black/African American students. Many of these same students are included in the EDS category, which was just above the threshold. It stands to reason that if the two aforementioned categories are an area of focus, the third will improve as well.

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

1. Equity - including cultural competency to build relational capacity and increase student engagement
2. Differentiated instruction - when examining data, it appears evident that Perkins teaches to the middle. The proficiency levels don't tend to be too much of a concern, as the gains obviously are. This includes gains for high achieving students as well as those that are struggling. Effective differentiation will provide each and every student with what they need to be make progress and increase our percentages of students showing learning gains.
3. Refocus on Math, but don't lose sight of ELA and Science and what is working in those subjects.
4. Intentionally use collaborative planning, including the curriculum specialist, to share what is working
5. Provide enhanced support for teachers in the area of Math (especially teachers with lower scores).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English Language Arts
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 66% proficiency, as evidenced by Spring 2019 FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack of differentiated instruction and culturally relevant teaching strategies. If DI and CRT would occur at an increased level and consistently, the scores would be increased by 5 points in each category (proficiency, lg, and l25 lg).
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The % of students proficient will increase from 66% to 71%, as measured by Spring 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is that implementation over the past year has shown promise. The improvements that were evident are sure to continue and increase as implementation of these strategies is more in depth and consistent.
Action Step	
Description	1. All 4th and 5th Grade teachers as well as administrators will become Gifted Micro-credentialed in order to support differentiation in all classrooms. 2. Teachers will collaboratively plan to implement enrichment and intervention tasks within lessons. 3. CRT and equity strategies will be used when choosing complex texts and task for students. 4. Small group instruction based on informal and formal assessments including MAP data, unit assessments, exit slips, and conferencing. 5. ELA Champions will facilitate PLCs to share professional development.
Person Responsible	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 64% proficient, as evidenced by Spring 2019 FSA. The problem/gap is the learning gains of the lowest 25%. This is occurring because of a lack of differentiation and culturally relevant teaching. If those would occur, the problem would be reduced by increasing the percentage of students making learning gains by 8 and increasing the percentage of l25 students making learning gains to 50.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The % of students making a learning gain will increase from 57 to 65, as measured by Spring 2020 FSA. The % of L25 students making a learning gain will increase from 23 to 50, as measured by Spring 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction, including Unit Assessments, Exit Tickets, MFAS and Illustrative Mathematics tasks, and/or "in the moment" student work analysis. Use student work to guide analysis of student learning in grade level PLCs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using the assessments to inform instruction, thus teaching the students, not simply the curriculum, will allow teachers to more effectively reach the students. It will also assist in the teachers more adequately understanding the standards and the expectations of their particular grade level.
Action Step	
Description	1. All 4th and 5th Grade teachers as well as administrators will become Gifted Micro-credentialed in order to support differentiation in all classrooms. 2. Equity and CRT strategies will be embedded in content area training. 3. Teachers will collaboratively plan to implement enrichment and intervention tasks within lessons. 4. Small group instruction based on informal and formal assessments including MAP data, unit assessments, exit slips, and conferencing. 5. MTLI teachers will facilitate PLCs to share professional development. 6. Number Talks routines will be modeled with staff and monitored for implementation. 7. Use of manipulatives for all students as needed, however intentionally with the students in L25 to build foundational and conceptual understandings.
Person Responsible	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 69% proficienct, as evidenced by Spring 2019 SSA Science. The problem/gap is occurring because instruction is not being differentiated. If differentiation would occur, the proficiency would be increased by 5.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The % of students proficient in SSA Science 2020 will increase from 69 to 74.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual development of key content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	More specifically focused instruction based upon the results of the diagnostic assessments to identify and meet the individual needs of each and every student through differentiated instruction and culturally relevant teaching strategies.
Action Step	
Description	1. All 4th and 5th Grade teachers as well as administrators will become Gifted Micro-credentialed in order to support differentiation in all classrooms. 2. Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st – 5th grade standards. 3. Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment. 4. Through unit assessments, embed standards that need remediation in the diagnostic review plan. 5. Implement 60 power word vocabulary lessons and 3rd-5th grade contests.
Person Responsible	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 40%, as evidenced in our ESSA subgroup data. The problem/gap is occurring because of lack of differentiation and CRT strategies. If additional differentiation and enhanced CRT strategies would occur, the problem would be reduced by 20%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The % of students proficient will increase from 40% to 60%, as measured by ESSA subgroup data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	CRT AVID strategies, Equity with Excellence, Differentiated Instruction. Collaborative planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When students are able to feel comfortable and relate to the instruction that they are provided, they will engage in the lessons and internalize their learning. When students are taught with differentiated instruction, they are provided what they need and their individual strengths are built upon. When teachers consistently and effectively collaboratively plan, they are able to learn from each other to benefit all students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Additional staff members will become Equity Champions. 2. Additional staff members will attend CRT training. 3. CRT and Equity training will be presented to the staff. 4. Use of CRT Classroom Audit will be consistent and will drive decision making throughout the year. 5. Administrators will monitor implementation of differentiation, equity and CRT and provide specific feedback to ensure continued focus on differentiation and meeting the unique needs of each and every student.
Person Responsible	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Conditions for Learning
Rationale	Informal data shows a discrepancy in the number of students being disciplined in and out of classrooms as compared to the number of students receiving incentives or rewards for positive behavior. This became even more apparent this year based upon the implementation of positive office referrals and the inconsistent use of them throughout the school.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The implementation of PBIS will increase and become more consistent with a more deliberate and intentional roll out in the beginning of the year, with specific expectations and periodic monitoring of implementation throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS and Restorative Practices, CRT and Equity Based teaching, Differentiated Instruction, Collaborative Planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When students and teachers have clear expectations with deliberate rewards and incentives in place, they are more apt to work towards those positive reinforcers.
Action Step	
Description	1. All staff will be introduced to the PBIS plan and monitored for implementation throughout the year. 2. Additional staff members will become Equity Champions. 3. Additional staff members will attend CRT training. 4. CRT and Equity training will be presented to the staff. 5. Use of CRT Classroom Audit will be consistent and will drive decision making throughout the year. 6. Administrators will monitor implementation of gifted, equity and CRT and provide specific feedback to ensure continued focus on differentiation and meeting the unique needs of each and every student.
Person Responsible	Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 5% of students with 10% or more absences, as evidenced in the CST report . The problem/gap is occurring because students get ill and occasionally family vacation plans are made during the school year. If better germ spread prevention and planning would occur, the problem would be reduced by 5%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The % of students missing greater than 10% of school days will decrease from 5% to 2%, as measured by the monthly CST reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize health lessons to instruct students in proper hand washing and other methods of preventing germ spread. Inform parents of the impact of missing school days and encourage better vacation planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If students were more consistent and effective in their own healthy habits, students would have less days of being absent due to illness. If parents were more aware of the importance of school attendance and the cumulative effect of missing days, they would be more apt to schedule family vacations during non school days.
Action Step	
Description	1. Utilize school nurse to instruct lessons on healthy habits. 2. Include information for parents in monthly newsletters. 3. Maintain communication with parents when students are absent.
Person Responsible	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	Our current level of performance is high, as evidenced in family participation in parent conferences, PTA meetings and school events. The problem/gap is occurring because many of the magnet activities are not specifically and intentionally tied to FSA standards based curriculum.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase family engagement opportunities that focus specifically on FSA standards based curriculum by 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Plan a family engagement activities designed to build capacity to support learning at home.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	While families are engaged in many magnet related activities, we would like to increase the involvement in activities that are FSA standards based.
Action Step	
Description	Plan and implement family engagement activities prior to FSA testing in Spring 2020.
Person Responsible	Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is Bronze, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation. The problem is occurring because of the lack of staff reporting of personal health programs tied to the initiative.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We expect our performance level to be Silver by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Will engage in wellness efforts through the Alliance for a Healthy School Generation Program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When implementing healthy skills, less absences will occur due to illness.
Action Step	
Description	1. School wide informational material will be sent through weekly updates. 2. Wellness Champ will give staff a survey and give PD based on survey data. 3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment
Person Responsible	Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 22%, as evidenced in our ESSA subgroup data . The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack of differentiated instruction and consistent ESE instructors. If consistency and increase of differentiation would occur, the problem would be reduced by 28%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The % of students proficient will increase from 22% to 50%, as measured by ESSA subgroup data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Stickles (sticklesk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction will benefit all students, but especially those that are identified as ESE by meeting their individual needs.
Action Step	
Description	1. Work with ESE ISD to support teachers in collaborative planning and inclusion strategies. 2. Onboard training for new VE teacher. 3. Embed CRT and Equity strategies in daily lessons.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Stickles (sticklesk@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: English Language Arts				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	1471 - Perkins Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Flocabulary is proven to deepen content knowledge, improve vocabulary acquisition and raise test scores.			

2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Mathematics**				**$500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	1471 - Perkins Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Flocabulary is proven to deepen content knowledge, improve vocabulary acquisition and raise test scores.			
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science**				**$500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	1471 - Perkins Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Flocabulary is proven to deepen content knowledge, improve vocabulary acquisition and raise test scores.			
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap**				**$500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	1471 - Perkins Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Flocabulary is proven to deepen content knowledge, improve vocabulary acquisition and raise test scores.			
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning**				**$855.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	1471 - Perkins Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$855.00
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**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$2,855.00**