

Volusia County Schools

Pathways Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Pathways Elementary School

2100 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

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

Demographics

Principal: Joshua Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Pathways Elementary School

2100 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>55%</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>33%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	B

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.

Together, we will develop the skills, knowledge, and values needed to address challenges effectively in a rapidly changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bailey, Holly	Principal	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary.
Flannery, Heidi	Instructional Coach	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary.
Kent, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 4th Grade teacher and part of the school leadership team.
Pascoe, Carolyn	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 2nd Grade teacher and part of the school leadership team.
Fuller, Christine	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. Support Facilitation teacher and part of the school leadership team.
Graf, Leah	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 1st Grade teacher and part of the school leadership team.
Zimmer, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 3rd Grade teacher and part of the school leadership team.
Jefferson, Tranesha	Assistant Principal	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary.
Fabulich, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 5th Grade teacher and part of the school leadership team.
Barrett, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. Kindergarten teacher and part of the school leadership team.
Hendrix, Bethany	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. Art teacher and part of the school leadership team.
Lawson, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. Multi VE teacher and part of the school leadership team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/28/2020, Joshua Jackson

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	67	91	95	97	119	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	104	102	102	126	134	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	24	11	20	22	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	16	30	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	4	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	104	102	102	126	134	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	24	11	20	22	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	16	30	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	4	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	68%	56%	57%	64%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	56%	58%	59%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	46%	53%	47%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	59%	63%	68%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	56%	62%	56%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	43%	51%	33%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	57%	53%	63%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
	2018	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	68%	54%	14%	60%	8%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	56%	5%	53%	8%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%
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	22	36	32	19	38	32	23				
ELL	40			60							
ASN	84	87		92	80						
BLK	47	52	30	40	67	58	40				
HSP	61	67		57	86		50				
WHT	71	67	50	73	77	49	71				
FRL	59	59	42	54	67	46	52				

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	18	29	27	23	38	28	24				
ASN	72	64		78	82						
BLK	48	47	9	38	48	56	31				
HSP	54	40		48	44						
MUL	62	60		62	70						
WHT	65	54	38	72	68	48	60				
FRL	51	46	26	55	57	42	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	10	28	32	12	25	25	15				
ASN	80	75		85	58						
BLK	39	57	40	40	40	27	27				
HSP	50	50		50	64						
MUL	69	83		69	67						
WHT	67	57	49	72	57	36	66				
FRL	52	58	49	56	53	32	51				

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

LQ ELA 47% (+15)

LQ Math 52% (+7)

Even though our LQ students gained, our SWD population scored lower than their gen. ed peers. Possible contributing factors - not enough grade level standards aligned instruction, consistency with small group instruction across the campus

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

No decline in any category

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.

LQ ELA Pathways was at a 47% compared to the states average of 53% (6% gap)

Even though our LQ students gained overall from the 2017-2018 school year, our SWD population scored lower than their gen. ed peers. Possible contributing factors - not enough grade level standards aligned instruction, consistency with small group instruction across the campus

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

ELL students had a 35% change

Master schedule included an intervention block for K-5

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

FSA Level 1 Students

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

1. SWD ELA Achievement
2. SWD Math Achievement
3. ELA Lowest Quartile
4. Math Lowest Quartile
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis we revealed that SWD had a proficiency rate of 22% in ELA. SWD have increased barriers in the learning process. Their achievement was below the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome: Increase SWD proficiency in ELA from 22% to 42%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher-led Small Group Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Dr. Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size.

Action Steps to Implement

Review data for SWD to finalize master schedule. Placement of students/groups of students will be determined for interventions and ESE services.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer IReady Diagnostic to determine baseline data

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly grade level PLC's that include Support Facilitation teachers to discuss SWD progress.

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct administrative walk throughs monitoring small group instruction

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a schedule to analyze district assessments and reflect on learning

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis we revealed that SWD had a proficiency rate of 19% in Math. SWD have increased barriers in the learning process. Their achievement was below the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome: Increase SWD proficiency in Math from 19% to 42%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher-led Small Group Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Dr. Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size.

Action Steps to Implement

Review data for SWD to finalize master schedule. Placement of students/groups of students will be determined for interventions and ESE services.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer IReady Diagnostic to determine baseline data

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly grade level PLC's that include Support Facilitation teachers to discuss SWD progress.

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct administrative walk throughs monitoring small group instruction

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a schedule to analyze district assessments and reflect on learning

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis data review, ELA proficiency was at a 68%, ELA Learning Gains was 67% and ELA Lowest Quartile was 47%. SLT decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA Lowest Quartile and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our LQ were SWD and Black/African American students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 47% to 54%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards Aligned Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Dr. Hattie, using teaching strategies at the appropriate level of rigor for standards aligned instruction has an effect size of .62.

Action Steps to Implement

Review Lowest Quartile data to create walk to intervention schedule within our master schedule.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer IReady diagnostic to establish baseline

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate Professional Learning on standards aligned instruction.

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct bimonthly PLC's on aligning standards to instruction

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct administrative walk throughs monitoring instruction and providing feedback

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a schedule to analyze district assessments and reflect on learning

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis data review, Math proficiency was at a 68%, ELA Learning Gains was 76% and ELA Lowest Quartile was 52%. SLT decided to focus on Math Lowest Quartile in order to improve Math Lowest Quartile and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our LQ were SWD and Black/African American students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Math Lowest Quartile from 52% to 59%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards Aligned Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Dr. Hattie, using teaching strategies at the appropriate level of rigor for standards aligned instruction has an effect size of .62.

Action Steps to Implement

Review Lowest Quartile data to create walk to intervention schedule within our master schedule.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer IReady diagnostic to establish baseline

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate Professional Learning on standards aligned instruction.

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct bimonthly PLC's on aligning standards to instruction

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct administrative walk throughs monitoring instruction and providing feedback

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a schedule to analyze district assessments and reflect on learning

Person Responsible Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

FSA level 1 students will be part of our intervention block where small group and standards aligned instruction will take place to meet the needs and address the learning gaps of these students.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

- ~School-Wide SEL (Sanford Harmony, CHAMPS)
- ~Attendance and Tardy Policies
- ~EWS Monitoring
- ~Teacher Retention (new teacher support group)
- ~Coaching Culture
- ~After School Clubs
- ~Celebrations & Traditions
- ~Active PTA
- ~Monthly SAC Meetings
- ~Fostering Student Leaders (safety patrol, student council, awards)
- ~Safety Plan and Procedures

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00