

Pinellas County Schools

Perkins Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	26

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

2019-20 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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Perkins Elementary School

2205 18TH AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">97%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">70%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	B	B	B	B

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kranzel, Laura	Principal	
Lennox, Daniel	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Laura Kranzel

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

556

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	84	88	88	89	84	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	519
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	11	13	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	3	1	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/19/2021

2020-21 - 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	90	90	90	90	88	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	13	8	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	90	90	90	90	88	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	13	8	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	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%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Proficient classifications:

Grades 1-2, ELA and Math: 50th-99th percentile as measured by NWEA MAP

GRADES 2-5 ELA and Math: level 3-5 projected FSA proficiency as measured by NWEA MAP

Grade 5 Science: score of 50% or higher on cycle assessment

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	55	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	43	41
	Students With Disabilities	71	57	29
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	64	52	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	39	39
	Students With Disabilities	71	86	86
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49	46	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	28	24
	Students With Disabilities	32	32	27
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	45	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	36	33
	Students With Disabilities	41	19	27
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65	52	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	41	38
	Students With Disabilities	20	8	17
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54	56	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	46	39
	Students With Disabilities	18	25	8
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68	64	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	38	30
	Students With Disabilities	13	25	25
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50	51	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	35	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	38
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56	49	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	32	26
	Students With Disabilities	15	15	8
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	53	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	34	27
	Students With Disabilities	8	23	8
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	83.5	98.7	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	72.5	97.5	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	41.7	92.3	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	23	21	20	16	36	30	23				
BLK	32	25	29	28	28	20	34				
HSP	85			70							
MUL	88			69							
WHT	78	50		61	48		70				
FRL	41	24	22	33	26	19	37				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	26	25	24	29	19	17				
BLK	43	57	52	43	37	15	31				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	290
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	78
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students with disabilities and black students are not scoring as well or making gains in any of the content areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students with disabilities, learning gains overall, and the L25 learning gains.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Additional needs for training in differentiating instruction, employing culturally relevant/equitable practices, and planning collaboratively.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA proficiency and learning gains increased, most significantly closing the gap of our black student subgroup.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Intentional monitoring of iStation minutes and data, implementation of LLI in small group intervention time. Celebrating iStation learning gains with cafeteria posters and ice cream.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Differentiated instruction to meet student individual needs, incorporating equitable practices.
Structuring and monitoring ELP and intervention blocks with fidelity.
Progress monitoring, including fading/altering of interventions, as needed.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Monthly book study - Hacking School Discipline and Equipped for Reading Success
Monthly curriculum meetings - with Curriculum Specialist

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Staff specifically scheduled to coordinate, support, and implement interventions in grade levels.

K/1

2/3

4/5

Use of ELA Champions, E3 cohort and teacher leaders for RP to support collaborative planning for equitable and differentiated instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our learning gains for our L25 students, as well as our proficiency scores for our ESSA Subgroups of SWD and Black/African-American need to increase in order to meet our goals.

Measurable Outcome: Our learning gains for our L25 students will meet or exceed 62%.
Our ESSA Subgroup proficiency scores will meet or exceed 41%.

Monitoring: Module assessments / Formative Tasks
MAP testing

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Facilitate ELA-focused, equity-based professional development that is teacher and student centered, instructionally relevant, and actionable.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If our teachers are trained in equitable strategies for differentiation, our student scores will increase and the gaps will close.

Action Steps to Implement

Include regular collaborative opportunities to rehearse and refine practices, examine tasks, assignments, student work, and multiple data points to determine progress and plan forward.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

Include regular discourse regarding educators' mindsets, expectations, attitudes, and biases about students to promote positive and high expectations for all.

Person Responsible Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

Calendar dates for all ELA training including pre-school, monthly staff training, and weekly PLCs.

Person Responsible Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

Increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading & evidence-based practices.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our learning gains for all of our students, our L25 students, as well as our proficiency scores for our ESSA Subgroups of SWD and Black/African-American need to increase in order to meet our goals.

Measurable Outcome: Our learning gains for our L25 students will meet or exceed 62%.
Our ESSA Subgroup proficiency scores will meet or exceed 41%.

Monitoring: Biweekly assessments
MAP data
Unit / formative assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Daniel Lennox (lennox@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ensure all teachers engage in mathematics unit planning and utilize assessments purposefully in PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers are collaboratively planning for equitable, differentiated instruction, scores will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

Calendar dates for all trainings focused on mathematics, including pre-school, monthly staff trainings, and weekly PLCs.

Person Responsible Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

Utilize district planning documents to incorporate mathematics unit planning into the calendar.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

Utilize assessment schedules to incorporate formative and summative assessment analysis into the calendar.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Science proficiency scores for our ESSA Subgroups of SWD and Black/African-American need to increase in order to meet our goals.

Measurable Outcome: Our Science proficiency scores for our ESSA Subgroups of SWD and Black/African-American will increase to meet or exceed 41%.

Monitoring: Cycle assessments and diagnostic tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Develop, implement and monitor a data-driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Fall Diagnostic Assessment and revise after data analysis of the Spring Mock SSA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If students are taught the standards that they are missing, their time will be used wisely in closing gaps in understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate science professional development through monthly meetings and PLCs.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

Provide and promote use of 60 Science Power words in 3rd and 4th grades.

Person Responsible Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)

Data chats and vertical articulation during PLCs based on unit assessments.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

Monitor the implementation of SSA review plan - through PLCs, Collaborative Planning, lesson plans with embedded review standards.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

Utilize equity related strategies and supports to include examples of diverse cultures and genders to ensure students feel represented in the field and study of science.

Person Responsible Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our proficiency scores for our ESSA Subgroup Black/African-American need to increase in order to meet our goals.
Measurable Outcome:	Our proficiency scores for our ESSA Subgroup Black/African-American will increase to at least 41%.
Monitoring:	Analyzing MAP and formative assessment/biweekly and progress monitoring data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitate equity based professional development that is teacher and student centered, instructionally relevant and actionable.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers continue to learn and implement strategies for Culturally Relevant Teaching, student achievement will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

Support teachers to deliver instruction responsive to backgrounds and cultures during PLCs and Collaborative Planning sessions with administration and/or curriculum specialist.	
Person Responsible	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)
Include regular discourse regarding educators' mindsets, expectations, attitudes, and biases about students to promote positive and high expectations for all through staff meetings and PLCs.	
Person Responsible	Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Our ESSA Subgroup of SWD need to increase in order to meet our goals.

Measurable Outcome: Our ESSA Subgroup of SWD will increase to at least 41% proficiency.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring through data chats to determine if interventions need to be altered, faded, or continued.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Stickles (sticklesk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaboratively plan with classroom teachers for grade level, student-centered complex tasks, deliberately planned with a trajectory of rigor and challenge, utilizing appropriate ESE strategies including: higher level questioning and explicit vocabulary instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and curriculum specialist all collaboratively plan, students learning will increase based upon best strategy and curriculum selection.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor the use of appropriate curriculum and supportive strategies to ensure student needs are met.

Person Responsible Kimberly Stickles (sticklesk@pcsb.org)

Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery, focusing on a clustering process to meet student needs.

Person Responsible Kimberly Stickles (sticklesk@pcsb.org)

ESE and classroom teachers routinely collaboratively plan for grade level student-centered complex tasks deliberately designed with a trajectory of rigor and challenge utilizing appropriate ESE strategies including: higher level questioning and explicit vocabulary instruction

Person Responsible Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)

Participate in professional development associated with but not limited to the above action steps.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

#6. Other specifically relating to School Climate / Conditions for Learning / PBIS

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current number of behavior incidents (negative) are disproportionately higher and our current number of positive behavior referrals are disproportionately lower for our Black/African-American students.

Measurable Outcome: The number of behavior incidents (negative) and the number of positive behavior referrals will be proportionate for all students, regardless of their race or ethnicity.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored by the number of incident or referrals forms completed and submitted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: If behavior expectations for students are clearly defined, communicated, agreed on, implemented by staff, and explicitly taught to students, the problem would be reduced by students better understanding what is expected of them.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As evidenced by the PBIS framework, the Tier 1 Universal Feature of Teaching Expectations indicates that active and explicit teaching of school-wide expectations clarifies concepts for students and adults, allows for practice and performance feedback, and reduces misunderstandings regarding what is appropriate at school. Integrating and aligning restorative elements with PBIS will enhance the effectiveness of the system.

Action Steps to Implement

Prior to the first day of school with students, the PBIS Coordinator will use the Tier 1 Walkthrough Tool to ensure signage reflecting revised Guidelines for Success (expectations) are posted in common areas and to evaluate evidence of classroom PBIS systems alignment to schoolwide practices. Subsequent walkthroughs will be conducted at least quarterly and followed up upon to correct any missing or misaligned pieces and to monitor consistency in application.

Person Responsible: Daniel Lennox (lennox@pcsb.org)

All staff monitoring student behavior in common areas will engage with students to provide feedback, both positive and corrective, and will refer to signage reflecting Guidelines for Success (expectations) that are posted in common areas when doing so. Ratios of reinforcement/acknowledgement of appropriate behavior to correction will be monitored to achieve a of minimum of 4 positive to every 1 negative. The Restorative Practices trainer will provide resources and modeling on how to incorporate use of affective language when providing positive praise and corrective feedback.

Person Responsible: Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

A system of recognition will be established to provide rewards to students for demonstration of positive and appropriate behaviors that are identified in the expectations/rules. By the end of the first semester, at least 90% of school members (students and staff) will participate in reward/recognition system and the rewards will be varied and reflect student interests based on student input.

Person Responsible: Heidi Vasallo (vasallo@pcsb.org)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The attendance rate dropped below 95% during the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The attendance rate will meet or exceed 95% in the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	CST will meet biweekly to monitor this Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Stickles (sticklesk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of Attendance Works, family and student education and awareness increasing through communication.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Families will support more consistent and higher rates of attendance when they are aware of the implications of attendance on academic and behavioral success.

Action Steps to Implement

CST meets biweekly.

Person Responsible Kimberly Stickles (sticklesk@pcsb.org)

Families receive proactive and reactive (problem solving based) communication from teachers and administration.

Person Responsible Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Higher parent involvement is indicative of higher academic and behavioral success.
Measurable Outcome:	90% of parents will attend at least one involvement activity per semester.
Monitoring:	Classroom teachers will monitor attendance and/or participation of their students' families.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zachary Riber (riberz@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Student performances as well as student led conferences will be scheduled throughout the year at various times in order to promote family involvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are excited and involved in school events will encourage their families to attend and engage in as well.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule student performances throughout the year.

Person Responsible Daniel Lennox (lennox@pcsb.org)

Schedule student lead conferences

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

#9. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our proficiency scores for our ESSA Subgroup Economically Disadvantaged need to increase in order to meet our goals.
Measurable Outcome:	Our proficiency scores for our ESSA Subgroup Economically Disadvantaged will increase to at least 41%.
Monitoring:	Analyzing MAP and formative assessment/biweekly and progress monitoring data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitate differentiated, equity-based, specially designed instruction, based professional development that is teacher and student centered, instructionally relevant and actionable.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers continue to learn and implement strategies for, equity, differentiated instruction, and specially designed instruction, student achievement will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

Support teachers to deliver instruction responsive to backgrounds and cultures, which are also differentiated and focused on specially designed instruction during PLCs and Collaborative Planning sessions with administration and/or curriculum specialist.

Person Responsible Heidi Vasallo (vasalloh@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

PERKINS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-1471 reported 0.5 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students.

2019-2020 Rating: Low

A violent incident rate per 100 students of 0.17

1 violent incidents / 580 students (Threat or intimidation)

2019-2020 Rating: Very Low

A property incident rate per 100 students of 0.00

0 property incidents / 580 students

2019-2020 Rating: Very High

A drug/public order incident rate per 100 students of 0.34

2 drug/public order incidents / 580 students (One weapons possession, One other major offense)

SBLT and the Threat Assessment team look at school wide behavior data to monitor student behavior and discipline data.

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.

The Sunshine Club (hospitality committee) was organized to rally our staff in times of celebration and provide comfort through pain and grief. We celebrate marriages, births, retirements, as well as share in sadness and frustration in times of sickness and death. We also set aside time in December to come together as a group before the new year, as well as meet monthly outside of school campus and hours for faculty field trips.

The Sunshine club organizes the faculty breakfast schedule, which occurs every month. This is an opportunity for us to have a moment together as a staff. This year the Sunshine Club has organized two retirements and four showers, and purchased numerous books as donations to our library in honor of deceased family members. These are just a few examples of ways we come together as a staff to "shower" our friends/family as we celebrate their accomplishments. This is one of the many ways we create a culture of respect and trust at our school.

Our PTA and PME (booster club) are active in the community of the school as well as organizing and providing opportunities for the staff, students, and families outside of the school environment.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Staff and Families - PTA and PME

Various staff members are on the hospitality committee annually.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School Climate / Conditions for Learning / PBIS	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
Total:			\$2,500.00