

Pinellas County Schools

Perkins Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Perkins Elementary School

2205 18TH AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

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 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

545

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	90	92	86	90	81	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	24	17	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	6	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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 6/23/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	55%	56%				66%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						67%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						52%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	51%	50%				64%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						57%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						23%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	62%	59%				69%	53%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	26	32	10	29	26						
BLK	25	40	40	33	45	31	30				
HSP	68	67		73	100						
MUL	80			70							
WHT	81	80		77	72		83				
FRL	38	48	38	42	54	37	50				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
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	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
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
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
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	35
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	77
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	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	79
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

ELA proficiency is an overall concern. It appears that Foundational Skills in Early Literacy are lacking, this affects all subgroups and content areas.

The L25 students are not achieving as much growth in Math or ELA as we would like to see either.

The Black and SWD subgroups continue to score below expectations as well.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

L25 gains in both ELA and Math, ESSA Subgroups of Black and SWD

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

Lack of foundational reading skills and need for additional differentiation and improved conditions for learning.

The addition of a K-2 Literacy Coach, as well as in increased focus on the professional development for the Science of Reading in order to address the gaps in foundational reading.

Implementing and monitoring the use of routine writing across all content areas.

Implementing a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks in early grades, including targeted instruction and frequent monitoring.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science Proficiency, significant learning gains and increased proficiency overall.

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

Focusing Extended Learning on those students showing the greatest need. Collaboration amongst teachers of various subject areas.

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

Continue to focus on identifying students for ELP as well as the addition of a K-2 Literacy Coach, as well as in increased focus on the professional development for the Science of Reading in order to address the gaps in foundational reading.

Implementing and monitoring the use of routine writing across all content areas.

Implementing a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks in early grades, including targeted instruction and frequent monitoring.

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.

Equipped for Reading Success, The Science of Reading, Book study on Shifting the Balance, Road to the Code, Focused note taking and improving conditions for learning.

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

Celebrating growth of students routinely, sharing strategies with families.

Implementing and monitoring the use of routine writing across all content areas.

Implementing a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks in early grades, including targeted instruction and frequent monitoring.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In order to improve our student achievement data in ELA, Math, Science, we need to focus on aligning instructional practices with standards-based lesson, tasks, progress monitoring and celebrations.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

100% of students will make at least one year's growth from Fall to Spring assessments in ELA.

100% of students will make at least one year's growth from Fall to Spring assessments in Math.

At least 60% of students will score at proficiency or above based on the Spring 2023 assessments in ELA.

At least 60% of students will score at proficiency or above based on the Spring 2023 assessment in Math.

At least 65% of students will score at proficiency or above based on the Spring 2023 assessment in Science.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring of progress will start at the student level, followed by teacher, coach (K-2 Literacy) and administrators. Periodic celebrations will be in place. Based on data and observation, instructional practices will be monitored and support provided as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Differentiation of instruction to meet specific student needs, monitoring progress toward meeting the standards, and planning next steps accordingly will increase student growth and proficiency overall.

Specifically, within Science instruction, students demonstrating gaps based upon assessments will be provided differentiated instruction during small groups, targeting the specific standards in which they are in need of remediation.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Implement and monitor the use of routine writing in all content areas.

Person Responsible

Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible

Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

Focus on teaching the content through the lens of the Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards. Monitor with use of district provided walk-through tool.

Person Responsible

Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

35% of black students were identified as proficient on the Spring 2022 Assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Black student proficiency in all subject areas will increase to at least 41% as measured by Spring 2023 Assessments.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Black students will be monitored for growth throughout the 2022-2023 school year in all subject areas by their classroom teacher and administration during PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Celebrate students' growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students and families made aware and able to monitor/celebrate student achievement will experience heightened academic success and increased proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Implement goal setting opportunities, where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress throughout the year, revising their goals based on data, and celebrating successes.

Person Responsible

JAYA EETEN (eetenj@pcsb.org)

Implement student-led conferences to allow students to share their academic goals and their progress with family members.

Person Responsible

JAYA EETEN (eetenj@pcsb.org)

Include celebrating the use of organizational systems and tools as part of the school wide PBIS system.

Person Responsible

Daniel Lennox (lennox@pcsb.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

25% of students with disabilities were identified as proficient on the Spring 2022 Assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students with disabilities proficiency in all subject areas will increase to at least 41% as measured by Spring 2023 Assessments.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students with disabilities will be monitored for growth throughout the 2022-2023 school year in all subject areas by their classroom teacher, ESE teacher, and district ISD during PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Stickles (sticklesk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Instruct students with disabilities in foundation skills necessary to engage in rigorous, grade level content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If foundational skills are mastered, students will be able to more effectively engage in rigorous grade level content, increasing their achievement on grade level assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Use evidenced-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Stickles (sticklesk@pcsb.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Gain a deep understanding of the BEST Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Gain a deep understanding of the BEST Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

55% of students in grades K-2 will be on track to pass the ELA FAST.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

55% of students will be proficient in ELA as measured by module assessments, district provided benchmark assessments, formative and summative assessments.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The ILT will conduct walk throughs of the classrooms and provide timely feedback to teachers. Data chats will occur in a timely manner in order to make data driven decisions in the classroom. Coaching cycles will occur based on data showing a need for improvement.

Data chats will come from module assessments, district provided benchmark assessments, formative and summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Kranzel, Laura, kranzell@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Data chats of school wide, district and state assessments in a timely manner.

Data driven decision making, derived from data chats.

Lesson study protocol

Coaching cycles

Professional Development

UFLI small group model

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Based on MAP and FSA data there is a majority of students in K-5 not proficient in ELA. These practices are research based and proven to increase proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Implement the instructional materials, understanding how the materials connect to evidence-based practices and BEST Standards.	Kranzel, Laura, kranzell@pcsb.org
Utilize administrator walk through tools to provide feedback to individual teachers, as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.	Kranzel, Laura, kranzell@pcsb.org
Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the BEST Standards in ELA.	Lennox, Daniel, lennox@pcsb.org
Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequent monitoring to ameliorate gaps early.	Stickles, Kimberly, sticklesk@pcsb.org
Increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading and evidence-based practices.	Kranzel, Laura, kranzell@pcsb.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Positive Behavioral Intervention Systems, Restorative Practices, Conditions for Learning, and Social Emotional Learning are all integrated throughout Perkins Elementary.

Guidelines for Success and Behavioral Expectations are introduced and explicitly taught to students during the first week of school and refreshers are provided on an as-needed basis.

Families and Community Members are taught the Guidelines during Open House Night and the first SAC and PTA Meetings for the year. The Guidelines are also posted on the school website, in all classrooms, and across the campus. Staff members are reminded of the Guidelines and provided with lesson plans during pre-school each year and are provided with reminders from administration throughout the year to keep them at the forefront of culture and climate discussions and instruction. We will have reminder signage throughout the school and teachers will respectfully remind students of these appropriate actions, describing what the action looks and sounds like.

Student misbehavior is addressed using equitable and restorative practices. If students have additional needs their teacher submits a Support Request for support to the MTSS Team. The Student Service Team will provide tier 2/tier 3 interventions to help them be successful.

Administration works to sustain a positive collaborative culture within the staff community by scheduling and attending weekly PLCs to discuss content, analyze data, goal-set and provide professional development. Administration also continues to sustain a strong and positive staff moral by providing weekly encouragement in staff newsletters, acknowledging a job well done, going above and beyond and promoting teacher leaders.

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

Laura Kranzel, Principal- leader in promoting a positive culture with staff, families, students and community members

Daniel Lennox, Assistant Principal-leader in promoting a positive culture with staff, families, students and community members

Kimberly Stickles, School Counselor-promoting a positive culture with staff, families, students and community members

Patricia Nettles- Family Community Liaison- promotes positive culture securing mentors, volunteers and community members to support the school

Families- support our scholars making sure their child is at school each day ready to learn, and participating in family events.

Business partners, PTA, PME- provide mentors and supplies for our students and staff to be successful in teaching and learning