

Volusia County Schools

# Read Pattillo Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Read Pattillo Elementary School

400 6TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kelly Lewis**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 96%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (56%)<br>2017-18: C (48%)<br>2016-17: B (58%)<br>2015-16: C (53%)<br>2014-15: A (62%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Read Pattillo Elementary School

400 6TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

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

## School Demographics

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>77%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>33%</p>               |

## School Grades History

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

The Read-Pattillo family and community are committed to creating an environment where every student will dream, reach, achieve, soar.

**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  |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Lewis, Kelly       | Principal           | The principal is responsible for the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The principal establishes an orderly, safe and secure school environment.                                  |
| McCormack, Corey   | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal supports the principal with monitoring the school's academic success which includes tracking the academic success and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The assistant principal establishes an orderly, safe and secure school environment. |
| Smith, Cindy       | Instructional Coach | As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.   |
| Anderson, Samantha | Instructional Media | As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.   |
| Schrader, Jen      | Teacher, K-12       | As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.   |
| Dinardi, Amy       | Teacher, K-12       | As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.   |
| Bolt, Jamie        | Teacher, K-12       | SEL/TOA: She provides support for the social-emotional competencies of all students through small group lessons and SEL program efforts.   |
| Stoddard, Donna    | Teacher, K-12       | As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.   |

**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     | 63          | 67 | 62 | 73 | 73 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 416   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 12          | 7  | 8  | 12 | 9  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |
| One or more suspensions         | 2           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 4  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |

**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 | 2           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

**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     | 12          | 6 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

24

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/5/2019

**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     | 17          | 12 | 11 | 8  | 13 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 70 |
| One or more suspensions         | 4           | 12 | 13 | 10 | 12 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 58 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 2  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 20 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 62 |

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 | 3           | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 32 |

## 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             | 54%    | 56%      | 57%   | 66%    | 55%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 52%    | 56%      | 58%   | 60%    | 53%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 53%    | 46%      | 53%   | 56%    | 44%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 57%    | 59%      | 63%   | 65%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 69%    | 56%      | 62%   | 47%    | 58%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 55%    | 43%      | 51%   | 37%    | 47%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 50%    | 57%      | 53%   | 78%    | 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     | 63 (0)                            | 67 (0) | 62 (0) | 73 (0) | 73 (0) | 78 (0) | 416 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 12 ( )                            | 7 ( )  | 8 ( )  | 12 ( ) | 9 ( )  | 12 ( ) | 60 (0)  |
| One or more suspensions         | 2 ( )                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 1 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 3 (0)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 1 (0)  | 4 (0)  | 4 (0)  | 9 (0)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 3 (0)  | 16 (0) | 19 (0) | 38 (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 | 64%    | 58%      | 6%                         | 58%   | 6%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 64%    | 56%      | 8%                         | 57%   | 7%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 49%    | 54%      | -5%                        | 58%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 48%    | 54%      | -6%                        | 56%   | -8%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -15%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 47%    | 54%      | -7%                        | 56%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 50%    | 51%      | -1%                        | 55%   | -5%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 49%    | 60%      | -11%                       | 62%   | -13%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 56%    | 58%      | -2%                        | 62%   | -6%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 67%    | 59%      | 8%                         | 64%   | 3%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 59%    | 60%      | -1%                        | 62%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 52%    | 54%      | -2%                        | 60%   | -8%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 64%    | 57%      | 7%                         | 61%   | 3%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 52%    | 56%      | -4%                        | 53%   | -1%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 63%    | 56%      | 7%                         | 55%   | 8%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 18       | 36     | 47          | 25        | 61      | 53           |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| BLK                                       | 29       | 38     |             | 38        | 59      | 43           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 23       |        |             | 46        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 64       |        |             | 57        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 63       | 56     | 64          | 63        | 74      | 69           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 46       | 53     | 58          | 50        | 68      | 52           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 10       | 26     | 27          | 15        | 17      | 6            | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 25       | 25     |             | 30        | 21      | 27           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 70       |        |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 59       | 25     |             | 60        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 62       | 49     | 35          | 67        | 55      | 42           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 46       | 38     | 35          | 50        | 41      | 33           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 30       | 41     | 35          | 23        | 31      | 18           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 58       | 54     |             | 54        | 33      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 75       | 64     |             | 67        | 36      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 67       | 82     |             | 67        | 64      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 65       | 57     | 48          | 66        | 47      | 43           | 77       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 58       | 57     | 52          | 56        | 46      | 35           | 72       |         |           |                   |                     |

**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  | 56   |
| 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                                       | 390  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7    |
| Percent Tested  | 97%  |

**Subgroup Data**

| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 40  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      |     |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| 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%        |     |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 41  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 35  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 61  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| 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   | 64 |
| 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                                | 52 |
| 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.

After reviewing the data, our Science achievement scores showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors to the low performance in science achievement are a lack of direct instruction and lack of unified response to data analysis and trends.

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

After reviewing the data, our Science achievement scores showed the greatest decline. Contributing factors to the decline in science achievement are a lack of direct instruction and lack of unified response to data analysis and trends.

#### 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.

After reviewing the data, both our ELA Learning Gains and Math Achievement components had a gap of 6% between our school average and that of the state average. Our ELA Learning Gains was 52% while the state was 58% and our Math Achievement was at 57% and the state was at 63%. Contributing factors to these gaps are a lack of direct instruction and lack of unified response to data analysis and trends.

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

Our ELA Lowest 25th Percentile increased from 33% in the 2017-2018 school year to 53% in the 2018-2019 school year. A new action taken to increase student achievement was targeted intervention for our lowest quartile.

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

Two area of concern is attendance (students below 90%) and students performing at a level 1 on state assessments in 4th and 5th grade.

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

1. Science
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. ELA Lowest Quartile
4. ELA Achievement
- 5.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>#1</b>   |   |
| <b>Title</b>  | ELA Achievement   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 54%, ELA Learning Gains was 52%, and Lowest Quartile Learning Gains was at 53%. Our SLT decided to focus on ELA Achievement, as this would improve learning gains and overall proficiency for all of our students, including our lowest quartile. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our ESSA subgroups, Hispanic and Students with Disabilities, are in our lowest quartile, so focusing on ELA Achievement will target this group.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase ELA Achievement from 54% to 61%.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Standards based focus board - learning targets / goals / success criteria   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | According to John Hattie, having learning goals has an effect size of .68. How we make meaningful connections between standards and the objectives is through a focus board, that's how we link the science of teaching to the art of teaching.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review student data</li> <li>2. Facilitate PL on standards based focus board - learning goals (September 16, 2019)</li> <li>3. Implement standards based focus boards in classrooms</li> <li>4. During weekly PLCs, discuss and plan standards based focus boards, include in PLC meeting agendas and minutes</li> <li>5. Monthly progress monitoring to review use of standards based focus boards</li> <li>6. Provide teachers with three half-day planning days throughout the school year to review student data, develop direct instruction (tier one instruction) plans, and create a common language for standards based boards</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)   |



|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| <b>#2</b>        |  |
| <b>Title</b>     | Science Achievement  |
| <b>Rationale</b> | As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Science Achievement was at 50%, which is a decline of 13% from the previous school year. |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase Science Achievement from 50% to 61%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Direct Instruction with deliberate planning and focus on student data.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | According the John Hattie, direct instruction has an effect size of .59. By reviewing current student data regularly and planning during PLC time to drive our science curriculum direct instruction, our student achievement will increase. |

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Step</b>        |  |
| <b>Description</b>        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review student data - district science exams</li> <li>2. Meet with district curriculum specialist to develop a plan based on current student data</li> <li>3. Meet weekly during PLC's to discuss and plan the weeks science lessons and focus boards</li> <li>4. Monitor effectiveness of direct instruction through data analysis (formatives and summatives at PLC meetings)</li> <li>5. Conduct learning walks with district curriculum specialists, coaches, and teachers during science instruction</li> <li>5. After each district science exam, meet to disseminate data and develop or alter instructional plan to meet students needs</li> <li>6. Schedule family science events in conjunction with PTA.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Kelly Lewis (krlewis@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).**

One school-wide improvement priority is school safety by addressing the social-emotional needs of students. One way this will be addressed is with the use of common expectations throughout the campus with our CRIMP motto to model positive interactions on campus. Another way we plan on addressing the social emotional needs of our students in identified ESSA subgroups is to set up a mentoring program and implement our H.U.G. strategy (Hello. Update. Goal) to help create a positive learning environment for our students.

**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.**

PFEP will be uploaded

**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.**

Read-Pattillo Elementary school ensure the social-emotional needs of all of our students are being met in several ways. First, we have Social-Emotional Learning times build into several of our grade levels master schedule to teach students positive ways to interact with their peers and how to cope with their emotions. We also have an SEL/TOA who hosts SEL small group lessons and provides SEL support to students and parents as needed. We also work with community mentors and an outside counseling agency to provide more support for identified students.

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

The school employs a number of supportive events to help with the transition of students from one school level to another. This includes:

- Kindergarten Orientation
- Meet the Teacher
- Kindergarten Expectation Night
- 5th Grade Learning Expectations Night
- Open House
- Incoming 6th Grade Orientation with local middle school

**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 improvement plan is data driven and focuses on areas of school-based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. Similarly, MTSS is a data-driven framework that seeks to find solutions/resources matched in intensity to student need in academic and behavioral areas. The MTSS framework follows the district's four-step problem solving process, with Rtl as an integral component of the process. As a result, the school improvement plan is based on a strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the school based leadership team) are matched to meet the needs of the students/school. Building the SIP within the context of MTSS results in the school determining the areas of most significant need and, as importantly, enables the school to develop a plan that can be addressed based on existing resources.

Programs supported by Title I include:

- 2 full time Intervention Teachers

TIPA Tutors

Supplemental funds for ongoing staff development as determined by the results of FSA data

Supplement Tutoring after school

Supplemental materials and supplies needed to close the achievement gap

Parent to Kids workshops to teach literacy skills to parents so they can support their children to become better readers

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

Read-Pattillo Elementary School fosters relationships with local community and business partners that positively impact our students. We host Publix Math Night with our local Publix Supermarket and host a Science night at the Museum of Arts and Sciences and at our school. We also incorporate career awareness opportunities through guest speakers from local business and industries.