Pierson Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pierson Elementary School

1 W 1ST AVE, Pierson, FL 32180

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pierson/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Hutcherson J

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/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 Volusia 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

Pierson Elementary School

1 W 1ST AVE, Pierson, FL 32180

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pierson/pages/default.aspx

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

We, Team Pierson, will engage all students in a rigorous personalized learning environment that fosters collaborative practice, creativity, and innovation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students engage in a superior 21st century education.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hutcherson, Kimberly	Principal	Serves as the steward of the school's mission, vision, and core values. Monitors achievement through ongoing progress monitoring, as well as school climate, to ensure an optimal learning environment and opportunities for involvement of all stakeholders. Identifies needs regarding performance or processes and implements a collaborative team initiative to focus appropriate resources and supports to increase student achievement, including data analysis, specific review of tiered interventions by grade level and individual students, frequent classroom visit and oversight of site based leadership team meetings as the team leader.
Deane, Catherine	Assistant Principal	Supports the academic goals through consistent involvement in monitoring achievement and working collaboratively with the principal and other leadership members and stakeholders to improve student achievement.
Henry, Christie	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a member of the leadership team to positively impact student achievement results and also supports faculty with instructional strategies, modeled lessons, pacing and planning, and data analysis. As a member of the leadership team, the Coach also serves as a content expert on instructional planning and curriculum, as well as a student advocate. These duties are embedded within the job role and also align with the leadership team's mission.
Rice, Lisa	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor provides overarching support of students identified with academic deficits by supporting teachers through PST process and MTSS tiered interventions. These duties are embedded within the job role and also align with the mission of the school leadership team in improving student achievement.
Henry, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	The Intervention Teacher supports student achievement through direct instructional services to the lowest quartile population and other students identified with academic deficits through progress monitoring. The duties embedded within the job role support the school leadership's team mission of improved student achievement. The teacher also serves as a collaborative member of the leadership team regarding ongoing monitoring of academic performance, content expert and advocate for students.
Robinson, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Teacher supports student achievement through direct instructional services to students with Special Instruction/IEP, which include some students in the lowest quartile. The duties embedded within the job role support the school leadership's team mission of improved student achievement. The teacher also serves as a collaborative member of the leadership team regarding ongoing monitoring of academic performance, content expert and advocate for students.

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	78	76	88	85	84	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	11	16	7	7	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	13	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
44

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/3/2019

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	6	13	12	8	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	13	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	39%	56%	57%	36%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	56%	58%	36%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	46%	53%	41%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	59%	63%	56%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	56%	62%	45%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	43%	51%	33%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	57%	53%	51%	59%	51%

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	78 (0)	76 (0)	88 (0)	85 (0)	84 (0)	91 (0)	502 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 ()	16 ()	7 ()	7 ()	6 ()	18 ()	65 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (0)	13 (0)	32 (0)	57 (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	50%	58%	-8%	58%	-8%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	54%	-22%	58%	-26%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
	2018	32%	51%	-19%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
	2018	63%	58%	5%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	59%	10%	64%	5%
	2018	57%	60%	-3%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	60%	-9%
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	56%	-15%	53%	-12%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	4	29	45	13	43	45	18				

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
ELL	33	44	63	57	61	54	32				
BLK	27			45							
HSP	35	43	63	59	61	54	32				
WHT	47	38	42	67	67	67	59				
FRL	35	40	55	58	61	58	36				

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	8	30	33	18	22	27	14				
ELL	27	42	38	43	30	23	31				
BLK	9	20		36	50						
HSP	34	42	33	51	40	22	45				
WHT	57	52		64	49		76				
FRL	36	41	35	52	42	25	46				

2017 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	8	21	29	24	32	22	5				
ELL	24	24	35	50	40	35	23				
BLK	18			55							
HSP	33	33	36	54	44	37	45				
WHT	51	45		65	51		70				
FRL	33	35	42	53	42	33	46				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	36
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	50
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Academic achievement of Students With Disabilities (SWD) demonstrated the greatest need in overall assessment results. While a number of our SWD did make learning gains, the subgroup persistently scores below level. Of those scoring below a level 3, there are several students served in separate class due to achievement gap of two or more years/grades as compared to assigned grade level. Appropriate academic supports and services are in place and will be continued in an effort to further reduce the achievement gap. The district decision tree regarding programs and services is also followed, with new programs, such as Wilson Reading and traditional Rewards program used as specified by program specialist/district.

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

Overall proficiency in science declined by 8%. The reading component on the science assessment is a barrier for struggling readers. This is particularly true for our ESOL population, as academic vocabulary is still a priority need for many students. Although hands-on science activities and fair game standards were reviewed, a different format for scheduling was utilized and may have negatively impacted science instruction. Grade level team members and intervention staff will collaborate to close instructional gaps.

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.

ELA overall achievement is the component that demonstrates the most significant gap when compared to state average. Several factors, including large population of ELL students and 86% of students identified as low socioeconomic, are attributed to the disparity in scores. Vocabulary and background knowledge deficits are also challenges. With appropriate scaffolding and consistent intervention, the gaps are closing for students. For example, 57% of the lowest quartile for ELA showed learning gains last year.

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

The most dramatic improvement was seen in two areas: ELA Learning Gains of the lowest quartile, which increased by 22 points and (all) Math Learning Gains. These successes are attributed to consistent direct support of students receiving ESOL and Intervention services. Students were given daily practice with on level text along with scaffolding and differentiated instruction. In addition, students received standards aligned instruction during all small group activities, including classroom teacher instruction and ESOL/ESE/Intervention teacher. This focused instruction increased opportunities for interaction with the standard and served as a catalyst to increase student understanding. Math gains are also attributed to small group instruction with differentiation and scaffolding.

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

Attendance continues to be the most significant area of concern across grade levels in regard to EWS. Students scoring at Level 1 is also a primary concern. Very few students demonstrate a need for tier 3 interventions for behavior. Those concerns are isolated in comparison to attendance concerns, which are more prevalent. Most behavior needs are adequately met through intervention and tiered support.

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

1. ELA Proficiency, including ESSA subgroup proficiency
2. Science Proficiency, including ESSA subgroup proficiency
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	Our ELA proficiency on 2019 FSA was 39%. As a result, our SLT has decided to focus on ELA proficiency of all students, which includes ESSA subgroups (SWD, ELL, Black/African American).

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA proficiency from 39% to 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Hutcherson (khutche@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards aligned small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Selected strategies demonstrate a positive impact on student achievement per Hattie's research, Marzano Center for Collaborative Classroom: 1. Clear learning targets/objectives and success criteria 2. Actively engage students with content, such as generating questions while reading, taking/organizing notes, summarizing, graphic organizers, anchor charts/concept maps and feedback. 3. Multiple exposures/standards aligned 4. Practice with identified standard and appropriate feedback 5. Collaborative structures

Action Step	
Description	1. Review FSA results, lowest quartile data and iReady diagnostic for school-wide /grade level trends to focus instruction. 2. Data driven student grouping to identify student needs, reading level and appropriate supports/services for small group instruction 3. Provide professional learning in the areas of standards based instruction, curriculum resources, and data analysis, with follow up coaching cycles and feedback to increase instructional capacity. 4. Communicate small group essentials, such as curriculum resources per each provider (classroom teacher, ESOI teacher, ESE teacher, Intervention teacher), schedule fidelity, technology component and standards aligned activities for focus standard during ELA small group instruction. 5. Ongoing Progress Monitoring (walk-through, data, review of student data cards in PLC) will be used to identify needs, adjust instructional pacing/grouping and evaluate student achievement/progress on SIP focus areas. In addition, individual students will maintain Student Data Binders to track their growth, with opportunities for Student Led Conferencing with teachers, SLT and parents.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Hutcherson (khutche@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	41% of students were proficient in science on the 2019 FSA, revealing an 8 point drop from the prior year. As a result, our SLT has decided to focus on Science proficiency of all students, which includes ESSA subgroups with proficiency below 41% (SWD, ELL, Black/ African American).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Science proficiency from 41% to 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Hutcherson (khutche@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards Based Instruction using formative assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Dr. Hattie's Research: Per Hattie (2012) "formative evaluation refers to any activity used as an assessment of learning progress before or during the learning process itself. In contrast with formative assessment, the summative assessment evaluates what students know or have learned at the end of the teaching, after all is done". Formative assessment answers the key questions: Where is the learner going? Where is the learner now? How will the learner get to where he/she needs to be? Two main purposes of questioning: To promote student thinking and elicit evidence of student learning, surface errors and misconceptions.

Action Step	
Description	1. Standards Based Instruction with clear learning targets and success criteria. 2. Fair Game Instructional Pacing/ Plan developed during PLC to ensure weekly review of prior grade level standards students will encounter on 5th grade science assessment. 3. Item Analysis will be conducted on formative and summative assessments to guide instruction and provide remediation on identified standards. 4. Weekly hands-on science Labs and Investigations with classroom teacher to support mastery of standards. 5. Students will engage with standards based STEM activities weekly with intervention teacher.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Hutcherson (khutche@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Writing Proficiency
Rationale	Data from 4th Grade 2019 FSA demonstrates a need for increased student proficiency in the area of writing, with only 9% of 4th and 5th grade students earning 70% or higher in the reporting category "Text Based Writing". As a result, our SLT has decided to focus on Writing proficiency of all students, which includes ESSA subgroups (SWD, ELL, Black/ African American).

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	75% of 4th and 5th Grade students taking FSA will achieve 70% or higher in the Text Based Writing reporting category.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Hutcherson (khutche@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards aligned instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Selected strategies demonstrate a positive impact on student achievement per Hattie's research, Marzano Center for Collaborative Classroom: 1. Clear learning targets/objectives and success criteria 2. Actively engage students with content, such as generating questions while reading, taking/organizing notes, summarizing, graphic organizers, anchor charts/concept maps and feedback. 3. Multiple exposures/standards aligned 4. Practice with identified standard and appropriate feedback 5. Collaborative structures

Action Step

Description	1. Students will engage in daily writing instruction and practice. 2. Students will be provided with feedback to improve writing skills. 3. Usage of text based evidence will be embedded in daily practice during the ELA block. 4. Four Writing Workshops will be conducted with grades 3-5, involving writing stations and cold writes with follow up feedback conferences to improve writing. 5. Data from Writing Workshops and other Wonders assessments will be analyzed at PLC meetings to identify areas in need of remediation or additional whole group instruction. 6. Writing folders with portfolio artifacts will be maintained to provide evidence of growth and learning.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Hutcherson (khutche@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders are built through interactions and communications that foster a collaborative and welcoming climate. All activities and interactions are focused on supporting the academic and social emotional needs of our students. The school's mission is to engage students in a rigorous personalized learning environment that fosters collaborative practice, creativity and innovation. By providing families with frequent information regarding student achievement and grade level benchmarks, along with strategies to use at home, the connection between home and school will be strengthened. A welcoming school climate is essential, as well as engaging families in meaningful opportunities to provide input for school planning and open communication with school staff. The administration, faculty and staff at Pierson Elementary believe in the importance of fostering connection with students which begins with a sincere, deliberate commitment to the belief that all students can meet high academic standards, and that schools have the ability and the responsibility to help every child reach that potential. Some of the annual activities include: Meet the Teacher, Open House, Literacy Nights, Parent-Teacher Conferences, Parents-to-Kids, Plaza Comunitaria, PTA events, School Advisory Council and Volunteer /Business Partner opportunities, as well as outreach services including Project Share, Food Brings Hope and Family Literacy Program.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The Pierson Elementary community of learners adheres to the standards of the Volusia County Code of Student Conduct. School administration, teachers and the school counselor work together to provide instruction to students on social skills, school safety, behavior expectations, bullying reporting and prevention. A comprehensive social emotional learning structure is in place to provide students with explicit instruction and practice with seven identified character strengths. Students are encouraged to report any concerns to teachers or administration. In the classroom, KAGAN strategies are implemented school-wide to build teamwork and collaboration skills in students. SEL programs selected for use with students are Ruler and Sanford Harmony. The strategies embedded within these programs are explicitly taught and serve to meet tier one SEL needs. Additional strategies are selected for tier two and three needs, including mentors, increased guidance services and links to additional services beyond the school.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Transition activities to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students include opportunities such as orientation, staggered start, middle school "boot camp" activities, on site visitations, speakers and informational meetings. These activities serve to create a shared knowledge foundation, reduce misinformation and create smooth transitions for students.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The School Leadership Team (SLT) meets weekly to review school needs and works collaboratively to meet the needs through available resources at the school and district level, as well as federal support such as Title I funding. The impact on student achievement is at the forefront of decision making and drives the instructional planning and allocation of resources.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Pierson Elementary has a volunteer and business partner coordinator who reaches out to local businesses and clubs, such as the local Lions Club and Kiwanis organization, with opportunities to partner with the school in offering gifts of time, talent, as well as to provide incentives and program support for student endeavors. Community volunteers receive training at the beginning of each school year. Pierson Elementary also enjoys a collaborative partnership with Food Brings Hope and the Barbara Bush Foundation. These organizations support after school tutoring and enrichment, as well as our Family Literacy Program, which serves both adults and students in reaching literacy goals. Throughout the year, business partners and volunteers receive recognition through having a month dedicated to them on the school marquee, names and contributions listed on the school webpage and newsletter, and through celebrations at the district and school level. Business partners serve to support student achievement through academic recognition and enrichment opportunities, which all help to support a climate of college and career readiness.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Writing Proficiency	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00