

Volusia County Schools

Pride Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pride Elementary School

1100 LEARNING LN, Deltona, FL 32738

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pride/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Eilene Ahr C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2019

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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: B (55%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pride Elementary School

1100 LEARNING LN, Deltona, FL 32738

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pride/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>78%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>60%</p>

School Grades History

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

At Pride we will strive to build meaningful relationships with students, parents, community, faculty, and staff in order for them to grow academically, socially, and emotionally.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

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
Johnson, Elizabeth	Principal	
Madison, Tracy	Instructional Coach	
Roberts, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Swindle, Amber	Teacher, K-12	
Sylvester, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
Miller, Joanne	Teacher, K-12	

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	77	88	105	99	85	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	6	7	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	9	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	2	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	0

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	49%	56%	57%	55%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	63%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	46%	53%	51%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	59%	63%	62%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	56%	62%	63%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	43%	51%	55%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	57%	53%	42%	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	77 (0)	88 (0)	105 (0)	99 (0)	85 (0)	97 (0)	551 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 ()	8 ()	6 ()	7 ()	10 ()	18 ()	59 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (0)	9 (0)	41 (0)	67 (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	51%	58%	-7%	58%	-7%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	54%	-7%	58%	-11%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	60%	5%	62%	3%
	2018	42%	58%	-16%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%
	2018	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	56%	-12%	53%	-9%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	55%	-3%
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	20	41	40	15	22	8	20				
ELL	27	33	31	41	42	17	25				
BLK	42	60		42	50		27				
HSP	43	45	37	53	47	25	37				
MUL	46			36							
WHT	58	61	54	63	49	20	61				
FRL	46	52	47	52	46	25	43				

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	13	21	19	18	26	22	15				
ELL	38	36	30	38	41						
BLK	46	44		42	25						
HSP	49	39	25	56	54	47	43				
MUL	42			42							
WHT	56	57	25	63	58	40	65				
FRL	50	46	28	54	50	36	51				

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	18	38	29	30	52	47	25				
ELL	49	63		57	74						
BLK	40	77		50	64						
HSP	57	66	47	59	68	61	34				
MUL	50			67							
WHT	57	62	56	66	58	44	50				
FRL	51	60	47	59	65	55	38				

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	47
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	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	41
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 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	52
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	45
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.

The lowest performing data component is in Math and Science. The trends are our SWD and ELL populations who are consistently under performing compared to our other sub groups.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was in Math. A factor that attributed to this decline was the entire school looping with their grade level.

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.

The greatest gap was with our SWD and ELL populations. They performed substantially lower than our other sub groups.

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

The data component with the most improvement was our lowest quartile which showed the greatest learning gains in ELA and Math. The action that helped obtain the growth was our push in ESE small group along with program specific training for ESE teachers.

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

The number of discipline referrals that students are receiving across all grade levels.

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

1. Math
2. Science
3. ELL students
4. SWD students
5. Behavior

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 FSA data, it revealed that our math overall proficiency was at 55% which is a decrease from 57% the previous year. Our SLT decided to focus on math standards-based instruction to improve math gains and overall proficiency for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Pride Elementary's overall achievement level will increase from 55% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards-based instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. This along with standards-based instruction/planning will create a solid response to intervention which has a .79 effect size based on Hattie's research.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review i-Ready, FSA, math unit tests to identify students for interventions, ESE and ESOL support. 2. Facilitate PL on small group instruction 3. Facilitate PL on standards-based instruction 4. District will conduct a 3 ACT Task math training on 9/16/19. 5. Conduct Learning Walks with coach, teacher and district staff during whole and small group instruction 6. Conduct monthly progress meetings with ESE, ELL, and intervention teachers to review data support services to plan instruction 7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in standards-based instruction
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 NGSS data, it revealed that our science overall proficiency was at 44% which is a decrease from 54% the previous year. Our SLT decided to focus on science standards-based instruction to improve science proficiency for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Pride Elementary's overall science achievement level will increase from 44% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards Based Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This along with standards-based instruction/planning will create a solid response to intervention which has a .79 effect size based on Hattie's research.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review SMT data and NGSSS data to identify students for interventions, ESE and ESOL support. 2. Facilitate PL on small group instruction 3. Facilitate PL on standards-based instruction 4. Conduct Learning Walks with coach, teacher and district staff during whole and small group instruction 5. Conduct monthly progress meetings with ESE, ELL, and intervention teachers to review data support services to plan instruction 7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in standards-based instruction 8. District support for PL on the 5E model 9. District Science Specialist Data Chat with Admin and Teachers
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 FSA data, it revealed that our ELA overall proficiency was at 52% which is a decrease from 49% the previous year. Our SLT decided to focus on ELA standards-based instruction to improve ELA gains and overall proficiency for all students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Pride Elementary's overall ELA achievement level will increase from 49% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	standards-based instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This along with standards-based instruction/planning will create a solid response to intervention which has a .79 effect size based on Hattie's research.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review i-Ready, FSA, ELA unit tests to identify students for interventions, ESE and ESOL support. 2. Facilitate PL on small group instruction 3. Facilitate PL on standards-based instruction 4. District will support standards-based instruction through PLC's focusing on the new curriculum (start date 8/29/19) 5. Conduct Learning Walks with coach, teacher and district staff during whole and small group instruction 6. Conduct monthly progress meetings with ESE, ELL, and intervention teachers to review data support services to plan instruction 7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in standards-based instruction
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@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).

District Math and Science support, push-in model for our ELL, ESE and intervention teachers, workshops to support standards-based instruction across all subject areas and implementation of a school-wide behavior plan.

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.

Creation of a school wide PTO, planned family engagement activities based on academics, SAC, and continued outreach programs such as, guidance counselor, parent support groups and parent liaison support.

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.

Guidance counselor supports students in group settings and as individual needs dictate. She also supports parents through resources and counseling sessions. SEL strategies are being implemented and shared weekly to include all students and staff.

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

Incoming and outgoing cohorts of students are supported through articulations, along with monthly partnership events such as spirit nights and fact fairs.

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.

Leadership team meets weekly to discuss data, student performance and teacher needs to dictate upcoming trainings, PLC's and resource allotments. After data review, supports are placed with deficiency areas. Trainings are determined based on staff needs and data results. District support is requested for curriculum expertise.

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

Grade level teachers reach out to area businesses, government officials, and school board members to skype/gain information to broaden students knowledge in the area. This provides students with awareness of colleges and different types of careers that are available.